

BULLETIN OF
THE JOHN RYLANDS
LIBRARY
MANCHESTER

Edited by the Librarian

VOL. 41

MARCH, 1959

No. 2

NOTES AND NEWS

THIS full page picture in vivid colours is one of the most striking in the Rylands Beatus manuscript.

The bird has a green and yellow neck, blue wings and ^{THE} tail and a red body. The serpent is blue in colour. ^{FRONTISPIECE}

The Commentary of Beatus on the Apocalypse is a manuscript of the second half of the twelfth century and is one of the treasures of the Library. It is profusely illustrated. At one time it was in the library of the Marquis d'Astorga. When his books were sold it passed into the possession of the famous French bibliophile Firmin-Didot whose bookplate it still contains. It was brought to England in 1879.

Among recent accessions to the Library is a collection of personal and political papers of Sir John Bowring (1792-1872) and his family. Perhaps best known as ^{THE BOWRING PAPERS} a linguist, a political economist and an administrator in the Far East, Bowring had a varied career. As a young man he was the intimate friend of Jeremy Bentham, for whom he edited the *Westminster Review* and, later, his collected works. During the 1830s he gained considerable experience in the fields of economics and commerce as the result of his employment by the government on various missions in Europe and the Near East. It was on his return from one of these that, in 1838, he met Cobden in Manchester and became associated with the formation of the Anti-Corn Law League. From 1835 to 1837 he represented Kilmarnock in Parliament and in 1841 was elected member for Bolton as a repealer. Alarmed at the trade

depression which threatened his fortune, invested in ironworks in Glamorganshire, he obtained in 1849, through his friendship with Palmerston, the post of Consul at Canton. In December 1853 he became Superintendent of Trade and Plenipotentiary to China and the following year was appointed Governor of Hong Kong and Chief Superintendent of Trade, a post he held until May 1859; as such he was responsible for establishing diplomatic and commercial relations with Siam in 1855. Bowring returned to England in 1859 and passed the remainder of his life in comparative inactivity.

The collection numbers some 1,000 letters and papers, of which two thirds directly concerns Bowring himself. The bulk of these relates to his activities in the Far East. Bowring held high office there at an important period in Anglo-Chinese relations and this collection is of value as containing two series of letters in which his views are expressed with particular frankness. They were written to his sons Edgar and Frederick. The former, no doubt because of his position at the Board of Trade, was his special confidant and to him, between 1849 and 1859, Bowring addressed some 270 lengthy and informative letters. Of these, 239 survive in the present acquisition. Bowring was a vigorous, sometimes precipitate reformer, eager to realize his ideas and impatient of "the old drag horses at home" and "the solemn formalities of dishonest official correspondence". His comments and criticisms relate to almost every aspect of affairs, from the broader problems of administration to local activities. He urged a complete re-organization of the whole colonial and consular system, with more emphasis on trade, for, to him, "the increase in Trade is the only object of Diplomacy in China". He was in despair at Governmental indifference to Chinese affairs and the false reliance on officials at Hong Kong; "as well", he writes, "study Great Britain from the Eddystone Lighthouse". For all these drawbacks he was convinced he had remedies. Together with official policy, the failings of those charged with its execution are examined, in particular Davis and Bonham, his predecessors as Plenipotentiary. The activities of the Imperial Commissioners Keying and Seu are naturally dealt with at length. No less interesting and pungent are his comments on the political

and commercial events of these years. Among other aspects on which he enlarges are the Shanghai Duty question, the opening of Japan, the Taiping Rebellion, the Inspectorship system, the Treaty with Siam, and relations with European and Chinese merchants. The lorcha "Arrow" affair, the subsequent military operations, Lord Elgin's mission and the events leading to Bowring being superseded as Plenipotentiary and relieved of the Superintendency receive, as one might expect, particular mention both in the letters to Edgar and in the parallel series to his other son, Frederick. The latter consists of 230 letters, of which seventy-four are concerned directly with Chinese affairs. Those for 1855-8 are particularly full and, in addition to the matters which the two series have in common, Bowring deals more specifically in his letters to Frederick with the question of law reform in the Far East. Frederick was a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and a barrister.

Also in the collection may be mentioned letters from Sir John to his first wife and other members of his family; miscellaneous correspondence of Edgar Bowring, including five letters from the radical politician Joseph Hume concerning the Shanghai Duty question (1854-5); letters, papers and diaries of Frederick Bowring; and a large group of letters to Katherine Bowring when in India from her mother Eliza Jane Bellasis. Katherine was the second wife of Sir John's third son Lewin Bentham Bowring, who was private secretary to Lord Canning (Viceroy of India) and Chief Commissioner of Mysore and Coorg.

The Library's collection of manuscript materials relating to John Ruskin is already extensive. In 1953 we received from Mrs. H. D. Rawnsley of Allan Bank, RUSKIN
LETTERS Grasmere, Westmorland, a donation of 600 letters and papers relating to him, of which over 500 are in his hand (BULLETIN, Vol. 37, pp. 3 ff). Additions to this were made in 1957 consisting of letters from Carlyle to Ruskin and his father and letters from Ruskin to Mrs. A. C. Strode and her daughter (Ibid. Vol. 40, pp. 3-4). Various aspects of this collection have been considered in the pages of the BULLETIN by Mr. Robin Skelton (Vol. 37), Dr. Margaret Spence (Vol. 40), and Professor C. R.

Sanders (Vol. 41, No. 1). The correspondence of Ruskin and Blanche Atkinson, now Ryl. English MS. 1162, is to form the subject of another article by Dr. Spence in the September BULLETIN of this year.

The collection has been further augmented by the recent acquisition of another sixty-two letters, of which fifty-eight are from Ruskin and four from his father. The main correspondent is the author and journalist Peter Bayne (1830-96), well known in his day as the editor of the *Edinburgh Witness* and the *Weekly Review*. The letters were not known to Cook and Wedderburn. They extend from 1855 to 1887 and cover a variety of topics but are mainly concerned with Ruskin's religious and ethical opinions. He expresses himself freely to Bayne on these matters, exchanges information with him regarding their respective works and comments on various contemporaries, among them Carlyle, George Eliot and John Stuart Mill. Of particular interest are his views on his father, which are given on a number of occasions. John James Ruskin was the cause of a violent quarrel between his son and Bayne, for Ruskin strongly resented their interference with his work. "I can take advice, and can ask it", he wrote to Bayne in 1860, "but I like no self-appointed guardians" and in an angry letter he informs Bayne in 1877 that "one of the chief causes of the sorrow and alienation of mind between us [i.e. Ruskin and his father], in later days, was the indignation with which I saw him taking counsel with you and one or two other very weak and narrow persons respecting my work". That Bayne and the elder Ruskin did in fact join forces to this end is confirmed by letters which they exchanged in 1859. In June of that year, for example, the latter writes to Bayne: "As he [Ruskin] reads all his M.S. to us [his parents] and most Letters, I judge the Letter sent you [for publication in *Witness*] is too violent and he fears to give us pain. It must consequently be unfit for your or any Paper and I earnestly intreat of you to hold it over a while till you can speak or write about it. My son has Genius and is a thinker but from being home bred and coming little among men after College years, he is too confident and positive and has got some strange notions from strange people, the best and highest

of whom are Carlisle [sic], Browning, Tennyson and Maurice." It is perhaps worth noting that at the time of this attempted parental control Ruskin was forty years of age.

In the previous number of the BULLETIN an account was given of an important collection of Clinton Papers acquired in June of last year. Numbering some tens of THE CLINTON PAPERS thousands of items, they consist of letters, papers and diaries of General Sir Henry Clinton, K.B. (d. 1829) and his brother General Sir William Henry Clinton, G.C.B. (d. 1846). The main features of the collection are (a) military correspondence and records of the wars against the French in the Low Countries (1790s-1815), in the Peninsula (1808-13) and in Sicily (1806-7) and of the campaigns in India (1803-4) and Portugal (1826-8), in all of which the two Clintons played important rôles, and (b) personal and political correspondence of the Clinton, Stanley of Alderley, Holroyd (Earls of Sheffield), Newcastle, Chester and Dawkins families.

An additional group of letters and papers which forms an integral part of the above has recently been purchased from a Paris bookseller. These relate mainly to the Quiberon Bay expedition of June-July 1795 and the second attempt at an invasion of France which took place the following month and was associated with the Count d'Artois. Included is a draft report relating to these expeditions in the hand of Henry Clinton, who was at that time Aide-de-Camp to the Duke of York, and a series of letters (26 August-8 November) to him from his brother, who accompanied the second expedition. Also in Henry's hand are accounts of visits to the forces made by the Duke in July (the Portsmouth District) and August (the Northern District) and an *Abrégé* of the campaign of 1796 on the Rhine and Danube. Other materials relating to the second expedition were acquired with the main block of Clinton Papers. Among them is an eye-witness account of events which forms part of a Diary kept by William Henry Clinton between 1 August and 31 December. William Henry, a Lieutenant-Colonel in the First Foot Guards, returned from France in January when he succeeded his brother as Aide-de-Camp to the Duke.

Among recent purchases are three fifteenth-century books which fit admirably into the Library's collection. The earliest is a copy of St. Bernard, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*, printed at Pavia by Nicolaus Girardengus, and dated 18 December 1482. The Library possesses several editions of works by classical authors printed by Girardengus at his first press in Venice in 1479 and 1480, but, hitherto, no example of the work of his second press in Pavia. After his return in 1484 or earlier to his native town of Novi, where he printed one book, he is heard of only once again, as the printer of the *Breviarium Romanum*, Venice, 1490. Of this work the two surviving copies, both on vellum, are in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and this Library.

Another addition to the list of fifteenth-century presses represented in the Library is the second press of Bernardinus de Misintis and Caesar Parmensis, which was established in Cremona about the beginning of June 1492, after the partners had worked for a few months in Brescia. The Library possesses several works printed by Misintis alone after his return to Brescia in 1494, but no example of the work of either of the earlier presses was to be found here until the recent acquisition of Francesco Petrarca, *De remediis utriusque fortunae*, printed at Cremona with the date 17 November 1492. When Misintis returned to Brescia his partner remained behind in Cremona, working with Rafainus Ungaronus. A note in the *British Museum Catalogue* draws attention to the interesting fact that the watermark of the Petrarch is composed of the letters : R V.

Of the earlier work in Bologna of Benedictus Hectoris, between 1493 and 1497, the Library has a number of examples. It has now acquired a specimen of his later work in Philippus Beroaldus, *Declamatio ebriosi, scortatoris, aleatoris*, 1499. This volume, with the second form of the Hectoris device, in which the damage to the lower border is already apparent, is printed in type 112R, and is interesting typographically from the occasional use of majuscules from type 114R, a fount which did not come into use until 1500. The association between Hectoris and Beroaldus, the leading Bolognese humanist, was very close. In 1487, when Hectoris was a publisher only, Beroaldus edited

for him an edition of Propertius. From 1498 until the end of the century Beroaldus, either as author or editor, provided the bulk of the matter issuing from the press, and the connection continued until his death in 1505. The *Declamatio* was among the most popular of his works, the Bologna edition being followed, in little more than half a century, by two editions from Strassburg, two from Paris, and one from Zwolle, and by two distinct French translations, one printed in Paris, the other in Lyons.

The Library was recently given the opportunity of purchasing such works as were of interest to it from a Cheshire private collection which was to be placed upon the market. Rather more than 100 volumes were selected and these included a number of items which add materially to the strength of certain sections of the Library. J. D. Harding's *Sketches at home and abroad*, published in 1836, marked the first appearance of the lithotint process of C. J. Hullmandel, who had discovered a method of producing neutral and graduated tints. Harding's work comprised fifty plates, printed in tints from two stones, and was dedicated to King Louis Philippe. The artist's patron expressed his appreciation by the gift of a Sèvres breakfast service and a diamond ring. A follower of Harding in lithotint was Joseph Nash, who gained celebrity by his views of late Gothic buildings in which he subordinated architectural detail to picturesque effect. His great work, *The mansions of England in the olden time*, appeared in four series between 1839 and 1849. The plates of the recently acquired copy are hand-coloured but they were also available in the plain state. Among other lithographic works acquired are the three series of *Sketches in Belgium and Germany*, 1846-50. They are the work of the Belgian lithographer, Louis Haghe, who came to England and entered into partnership with Charles Day. Their work, in the words of Lionel Cust, "raised lithography to perhaps the highest point to which it ever attained".

Two interesting sixteenth century books form part of the purchase. The Library possesses twenty-three editions of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* printed in Venice during that period. In the second half of the century two rival Venetian firms, the Valgrisi and the Valvassori presses, produced more than a score of editions

between them. Already in the Library are six of the Valgrisi editions, including that of 1556, generally held to be the most desirable, but the present acquisition, the Valvassori edition of 1556, is the first representative of the series from that press. From another famous press, Plantin at Amsterdam, comes a copy of *Cinquante Meditations De La Vie Et Lovanges De La Vierge Marie*, 1590. First written in Latin it was the work of Franciscus Coster, author of many theological and devotional books, who earned the sobriquet of *Malleus Haereticorum*. Each meditation is illustrated by an engraving, the first of which bears the signature of Petrus van der Borcht. It is curious that although the Library has no works of Coster in their original Latin it has also another rare translation. Of his *Meditations of the Whole Historie of the Passion of Christ*. Translated by R. W. [i.e. Lawrence Worthington] 1616, stated on the title-page to be "Printed at Doway", but probably the work of a secret press in England, *STC* records two copies only, in the British Museum and Cambridge University Libraries. Bishop was unable to add to the number but in Mr. Ramage's recent *Finding-list* appear two further copies, Rylands and Ushaw College.

The connection with Unitarianism of the family from which this purchase was made yielded a number of items relating to the history of that church. There are printed minutes and reports of the Hibbert Trustees from 1855 to 1890, with the Trust Deed of Robert Hibbert, printed in 1852, for the establishment of the Anti-Trinitarian Fund. It was soon felt that this name was too aggressive and the title was changed to Hibbert Trust, of which the aim was to increase the inducements to cultivated men to become pastors of Unitarian congregations. Families from the Manchester neighbourhood which provided Trustees from time to time were Philips, Grundy, Greg and Worthington. Hymnals in the collection include those of H. E. Howse and James Martineau (at one time pastor of Paradise Street Congregation, Liverpool, and later principal of Manchester New College), and *A selection of psalms and hymns for public and private worship* printed in Liverpool in 1818 for "the Congregation of Unitarian Christians assembling in Renshaw Street Chapel" in that city.

The most considerable gifts during the past half-year were by way of bequest. The earlier was that of the late E. Kenneth Brown, member of a family which has been closely associated with the government of the Library since its foundation, two of its members having been Honorary Secretary to the Council for long periods. As a young man Mr. Brown became interested in railway history and throughout his life devoted much care and thought to bringing together material relating to the subject. "The Kenneth Brown Railway Collection" now added to the Library numbers over 1,300 volumes (600 monographs, 225 pamphlets, 220 bound maps and 281 vols. of periodicals), 153 prints and many photographs.

PRINTED
BOOKS:
ACCESSIONS
BY GIFT

The earliest work is Desaguliers, *A course of experimental philosophy*, 1734-44, probably the first "railway" book, since it contains a description of the wooden railway constructed at Prior Park, Bath, by Ralph Allen to carry stone from quarry to riverside. Other early books on the origin of railways are Curr, *The coal viewer*, Sheffield [1797], the author of which lays claim to the invention of flanged cast-iron rails, Palmer, *Description of a railway on a new principle*, 1823, in which the monorail is first advocated, and [Gray], *Observations on a general iron railway*, 1823. There is a large collection of Acts of Parliament authorizing railway projects including the Oystermouth tram road, 1804, Stockton to Darlington, 1823, Leeds to Selby, 1830, Polloc and Govan to Clyde, 1830, London to Birmingham, Warrington to Birmingham, Whitby to Pickering, 1833, and Bristol to Exeter, with branches, 1836-8. The Act approving a Stratford to Moreton railway, 1821, has with it an interesting poster advertising a market at Moreton to coincide with the opening of the line in 1826. Emphasis is laid on the tremendous railway activity in the forties by the number of Acts in the collection relating to East Anglia alone. There are two in 1844, five in 1845, three in 1846 and five in 1847. Parliament's preoccupation with railways is also reflected in the many reports of Committee such as those on steam carriages, 1832, railway bills, 1836, locomotive engines used in narrow streets, 1836, railway communications in Ireland, 1837-8, and between London and

Birmingham, 1848, communications between London, Dublin, Edinburgh and Glasgow, 1840-1, carrying goods on Sundays, 1841, and atmospheric railways, 1842. Reports of Committees sitting on bills for particular railways are also included, as, for instance, those on the *Manchester and Liverpool railroad bill*, 1825, and the *Railway from Sheffield to Rotherham*, 1836.

The collection is rich in reports by civil engineers and others on projected schemes. Among such reports from the early days of railway history are Robert Stevenson's on lines from the coal-field of Mid-Lothian to Edinburgh, 1819, and from Perth into the vale of Strathmore, 1827, E. L. Stephens's on a railway from Southampton to London, 1831, the Provisional Committee's on the Sheffield and Manchester Railway, 1831, Wood, Hawkshaw and Brunel's on the Great Western Railway, 1838, and an anonymous report on projected routes between Bath and Basing, 1834. Equally well represented are the works of mechanical engineers, early examples of which are Galloway, *History of the steam engine*, 1826, Tredgold, *The steam engine*, 1827, and Marshall, *Description of the patent locomotive steam engine of R. Stevenson & Co.*, 1838. The biographical section of the bequest covering engineers, both civil and mechanical, and promoters of railroads is very extensive.

Among early plans are *Plan of the intended Liverpool and Manchester railway*, Jan. 29, 1825, and a copy of *A plan of the proposed Central Kent Railway, surveyed 1839-40*, which, it is claimed, belonged to Disraeli when M.P. for Maidstone. Early operating manuals include the *Rules and regulations of the Grand Junction Railway*, 1839, and *of the Eastern Counties Railway*, 1854, and *General instructions to superintendents, clerks, guards, etc.*, 1851, of the South Wales Railway. Interesting items intended for the edification of the passenger, folding *Travelling charts*, one from London to Winchester, one from Basingstoke to Winchester and Southampton, and one from London to Wolverton, were issued by the *Railway chronicle* in 1845. They are each printed on a single folding sheet and give descriptions of the lines with illustrations of the country traversed. The bound maps range in date from the earliest period of English railways, to the early years of this century. At first they relate

for the most part to an individual railway and were for internal use, some being elaborately bound for the use of directors. Later many maps of individual lines were made for the use of the traveller, and these were followed by such general railway maps as those of Airey and the Railway Clearing House. One interesting volume contains twenty maps of "competing lines of railway" in various parts of the country. These were issued in 1845 in connection with reports of the Railway Department of the Board of Trade.

In this note the earlier and rarer items have been singled out for mention but the collection comprises valuable material, both descriptive and historical, on English railways down to their grouping in 1923, and to a limited extent on foreign railways. There is much pictorial matter, both as individual prints and in substantial works such as Bourne, *History of the Great Western Railway*, 1846 (a series of lithographed plates), Bury, *Six coloured views of the Liverpool and Manchester railway*, Ackermann, 1831, and Fairbairn, *Illustrations of the construction of the Britannia and Conway Tubular bridges*, 1849. The collection of periodicals includes the *Railway magazine*, 1837-61, the *Railway Record*, 1852-55, *The Railway times*, 1839-45, and the *Railway magazine*, 1897 to date. There is a set of *Bradshaw's shareholder's guide* from 1848 to 1911; the 1848 issue bears a presentation inscription by George Bradshaw to R. Creed, first Secretary of the London and Birmingham Railway. The collection is made the more comprehensive by the addition of a number of early Bradshaw and other timetables, and provides invaluable source material for the student of the history of British railways.

The second bequest came to the Library through the good offices of the National Art Collections Fund to which the disposal of the library of the late Mrs. S. S. Payne had been entrusted. Among other interesting and valuable books is Redouté, *Les liliacées*, vols. 1-5, Paris, 1802-10. Redouté first came into contact with stipple engraving when he was in England in 1786. He perfected a method of his own which his assistants practised under his direction, and which earned for him a medal from King Louis XVIII. Another welcome acquisition is the fine collection of coloured aquatints, *Oriental scenery*, in five parts, 1795-1803,

generally accepted as the finest work of the Daniells, uncle and nephew. It was published at a subscription price of 200 guineas, and in view of this it is interesting to note that at one time the payment to the army of colourists employed in the multiplication of the prints was one shilling per print. Also of interest is *Catlin's North American Indian portfolio*, London [1844], which was a product of the partnership of Haghe and Day referred to above. To preserve the knowledge of the customs and of the various types of Indians Catlin projected a gallery of paintings. He painted some 600 portraits of Indians in their native costume, the greatest obstacle to their execution being the superstitious belief of the Indians that they would die if their portraits were painted. More than once the artist escaped death only by flight. Other works included in the gift, which comprised in all twenty-three volumes, are Perry, *Conchology*, [1811], Morris, *Flora conspicua*, [1826], a series of hand-coloured engraved plates by W. Clark, and a copy of the 1635 edition of Pliny, *The Historie of the World*, printed by Adam Islip for John Grismond (STC 20030a).

The following is a list of recent Library Publications, consisting of reprints of articles which appeared in the latest issue of the BULLETIN (September 1958):

“The Conciliar Movement in Recent Study”. RECENT
LIBRARY
PUBLICATIONS
By E. F. Jacob, Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. 8vo, pp. 28. Price three shillings net.

“An Alleged Worcester Charter of the Reign of Edgar”.
By Eric John, Lecturer in History, University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 25. Price three shillings net.

“Robert Boyle and the Irish Bible”. By R. E. W. Maddison 8vo, pp. 21, with five plates. Price three shillings net.

“The 39th Regiment of Foot and the East India Company, 1754-1757”. By John Roach, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. 8vo, pp. 37. Price three shillings and sixpence net.

“Socialism and the French Revolution: The Cercle Social and the Enragés”. By R. B. Rose. 8vo, pp. 28. Price three shillings net.

"The Book of Job and its Meaning". By H. H. Rowley, Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 41. Price three shillings and sixpence net.

"Carlyle's Letters to Ruskin: a Finding List with some Unpublished Letters and Comments." By Charles Richard Sanders, Professor of English at Duke University, North Carolina. 8vo, pp. 31. Price three shillings net.

"Hermocrates the Syracusan." By H. D. Westlake, Hulme Professor of Greek in the University of Manchester. 8vo, pp. 30. Price three shillings net.

Since the last issue of the BULLETIN the following donors have made valuable gifts to the Library, and to them the Governors offer grateful thanks.

PRINTED
BOOKS:
LIST OF
DONORS

Individual Donors

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| A. M. Allen, Esq. | Miss M. H. Harrison [2]. |
| Miss M. M. Armitage [12]. | R. E. Haslam, Esq. [2]. |
| Dr. Franz Babinger. | K. W. Humphreys, Esq. |
| Sir Thomas D. Barlow. | Geoffrey Hunter, Esq. |
| Norman Bates, Esq. | Mr. and Mrs. Donald F. Hyde. |
| Professor H. Hale Bellot [54]. | Israel, H. E. the Ambassador |
| Dr. Martin Bodmer. | of [10]. |
| The Rev. F. W. Bone [2]. | Mrs. C. Jackson. |
| Miss J. Booth. | Captain R. Lloyd Jones [2]. |
| The Rev. Dr. John Bowman | Joseph W. Jurowski, Esq. |
| [2]. | Judge Neville Laski [4]. |
| E. Kenneth Brown, Bequest | Meinheer C. J. van der |
| of the late [1306]. | Meulen [2]. |
| Dr. W. H. Chaloner. | Dr. Francis Neilson. |
| L. W. A. Chard, Esq. [2]. | The Rev. Don Cleveland |
| John L. Davenport, Esq. | Norman. |
| Signor L. Donati. | H. Palmer, Esq. |
| Charles E. Feinberg, Esq. [9]. | D. Patterson, Esq. [2]. |
| Herr C. Habersaat. | Mrs. S. S. Payne, Bequest of |
| H. Hargreaves, Esq. | the late [23]. |

Dr. Helmut Presser.	Herr A. Streuli.
The Rev. R. Way-Rider.	Roy Sudall, Esq.
Dr. Oskar K. Rabinowicz.	J. Taylor, Esq. [2].
R. B. Rose, Esq.	Professor G. H. Turnbull [3].
The Rev. Professor H. H. Rowley, D. D. [5].	S. A. Warner, Esq.
A. Rubinstein, Esq.	The Rev. J. T. Wilkinson.
R. Shackleton, Esq.	Miss E. Willans [2].
S. H. Shaw, Esq. [2].	Oscar Williams, Esq. [2].
The late Dr. Marie Stopes	B. R. Wilson, Esq.
[17].	Paul Winter, Esq. [3].
	Professor Dr. H. Wolter.

Institutions

Aarhus University Library.
 Aberdeen University Library.
 Aberystwyth : National Library of Wales.
 Algeria : Sous-Direction des Beaux-Arts.
 American Catholic Philosophical Association.
 Amsterdam : Rijksmuseum.
 Bangalore : Indian Institute of Culture [3].
 Basel University Library [17].
 Beirut : American University Library [3].
 Berlin : Staatliche Museen [8].
 Beuron : Erzabtei.
 Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, Charlottesville [2].
 Birmingham University Library.
 Bratislava : Ústredná Technická Knižnica.
 Brescia : Ateneo.
 British Museum, Trustees of the [3].
 Budapest : Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum [2].
 Budapest : National Széchényi Library [10].
 Canberra : Commonwealth Library.
 Church of England Council on Foreign Relations.
 Copenhagen : Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab.
 Costa Rica University Library.
 Darmstadt : Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung.
 Debrecen : Museum.

East and West Library.
Edinburgh : National Library of Scotland.
Edinburgh University Library.
Erlangen University Library [2].
Florence : Kunsthistorisches Institut.
Foreign Office.
Friends of the National Libraries.
Genoa University : Istituto di Filologia Classica.
Gothenburg University Library [3].
Groningen University Library [7].
Hamburg : Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek.
Heidelberg University Library [3].
Helsinki : Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
Helsinki University Library [12].
Illinois University Library.
India : National Archives.
Innsbruck University Library [4].
The Jacob Rosenheim Foundation.
Kentucky University Library [8].
Leeds University Library.
Leiden University Library [7].
Leningrad : Academy of Sciences [11].
The Library Journal.
Lincolnshire County Council : Archives Committee.
Liverpool : Walker Art Gallery [2].
London : Institute of Classical Studies [10].
London : Institute of Historical Research.
London : School of Oriental and African Studies.
London : University College Library [33].
Louvain University Library [9].
Manchester Corporation.
Manchester University.
Manchester University Press [10].
Massachusetts Historical Society.
Memmingen : Stadtbibliothek.
Mendoza University Library [2].
Michigan University Library [6].
Moscow : Lenin State Library.

Munich : Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.
 National Art Collections Fund [23].
 National Register of Archives [88].
 New York : Pforzheimer Library [2].
 New York : Pierpont Morgan Library.
 New York Public Library.
 Notre Dame, Indiana, University Library.
 Palma de Mallorca : Schola Lullistica.
 The Pilgrim Trust.
 Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Limited [11].
 Pretoria : University of South Africa Library [4].
 Reading University.
 Rome : Istituto Storico Domenicano.
 Saar University Library.
 Saint Andrews University Library.
 San Marino, Cal. : Henry E. Huntington Library.
 Santo Domingo University Library [5].
 Sarajevo : Oriental Institute.
 Sheffield University.
 Skoplje : Institut de l'Histoire Nationale [5].
 Société d'Émulation des Côtes-du-Nord, Saint-Brieuc [8].
 Société des Bollandistes [3].
 Solesmes : Abbaye de Saint Pierre.
 Southampton University.
 Stockholm : Kungliga Biblioteket.
 Swedenborg Society.
 Szeged University Library.
 United States of America : National Archives [11].
 Uppsala University Library.
 Utrecht University Library [25].
 Warsaw : Polska Akademia Nauk : Komitet Orientalistyczny [2].
 Washington : Smithsonian Institution.
 Washington University Library.
 Yale University Library [2].
 Zionist Central Council of Manchester & District.

In addition to these donations many learned societies and other bodies have continued to present copies of their periodical publications.

THE PATRISTIC ACCOUNTS OF JEWISH SECTARIANISM¹

By MATTHEW BLACK, D.D., D.LITT., F.B.A.

PRINCIPAL OF ST. MARY'S COLLEGE AND PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY AND
BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS

THE discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, now generally assigned to a date prior to A.D. 70, and the identification of the Qumran sect with the ancient Essenes (which I think is correct), has given a fresh impetus to the study of pre-Christian Judaism, in the different forms it had come to assume in the century before and after the beginning of the Christian era. The main sources for such a study—next to the scrolls themselves—are the reports of pre-Christian Jewish “sects” in the works of the first-century historian of Palestine, Josephus, and of his contemporary, the Alexandrian philosopher, Philo Judaeus. Hebrew sources, Talmud, Mishnah, etc., come next, and Jewish scholars are making their own distinctive contribution to this subject.

There is a third type of evidence available—I would not say always as valuable—in the reports of Jewish “sects” or “heresies” in the early Fathers of the Church.

Among more recent discussions of this evidence is a Paper read at the Patristic Conference in Oxford in 1955, entitled *Les sectes juives d'après les témoignages patristiques*, by Professor M. Simon of Strasbourg.² M. Simon confines himself for the most part to the second-century lists of Justin Martyr and Hegesippus; the later lists and accounts of Jewish “heresies”, such as those in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Ephrem Syrus, Isidore of Seville, Epiphanius and the Pseudo-Jerome, are set aside as largely dependent on the second-century catalogues, supplemented by information drawn from Josephus and the Gospels. Justin and Hegesippus themselves appear to get their

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 10th of December, 1958.

² *Studia Patristica*, vol. 1 (T. U. lxiii, Berlin, 1957).

material about the older pre-Christian "sects", Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, either from Josephus or the Gospels (though it is surprising to find Justin omitting the Essenes altogether). When we subtract these older and well-known groups (including the Samaritans), and suspend judgement on the Galileans and Meristai (possibly a Gnostic group), what is left consists, for the most part, of very general descriptions of tendencies within the Judaism of Justin's own period, but not "heresies" in the strict ecclesiological sense of unorthodox bodies existing on the margin of the Synagogue and under its ban; they are only "heresies" for the Fathers, who interpret "la réalité juive à travers une optique chrétienne" (p. 538).

The passage in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* (lxxx) opens with a question from Trypho whether all Christians really believed in the Parousia. Justin's reply is that all Christians do so believe; but that even among Christians there are godless and unbelieving heretics, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ Ἰουδαίους, ἃν τις ὀρθῶς ἐξετάσῃ, ὁμολογήσειεν εἶναι τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους ἢ τὰς ὁμοίας αἵρέσεις Γενιστῶν καὶ Μεριστῶν καὶ Γαλιλαίων καὶ Ἑλληνιανῶν καὶ Φαρισαίων [καὶ] Βαπτιστῶν (just as, if one were to look into the matter rightly, one would not acknowledge to be Jews those who are Saddoukaioi or similar sects of Genistai and Meristai and Galileans, and Hellenians and Pharisees (and) Baptists.)

It is clear that Justin believed himself to be describing *Jewish heretics*; if his argument was to carry any weight with Jews (and that seems to have been its intention), it is unlikely that he would destroy his case by including respectable Jewish groups in such a list, even though he himself may have looked at all such groups *à travers une optique chrétienne*. There is also his general trustworthiness in this connection to be considered; Lukyn Williams writes of him: "The more the *Dialogue* is studied, the deeper becomes the impression of the general accuracy of Justin's presentation of Judaism, as well as the width of his knowledge of it."¹ M. Simon, moreover, favours the view that Justin's Genistai is simply a Greek translation of the Hebrew word Minim, a general term for all "heretics". He does not,

¹ *Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho*, Translations of Greek Literature Series I—Greek Texts (S.P.C.K., London, 1930), p. viii.

however, mention the *Birkath ha-Minim* in Hadrian's time. The Minim were banned by the Synagogue in the early second century, and though the ban was especially directed against Jewish Christians, it was intended for all Jewish "heretics".

Such groups, however general the description applied to them, may well have all constituted dangerous "heresies" or sects on the margin of the Synagogue and under its ban. (If Simon is correct in his explanation of the Meristai as Jewish Gnostics who "divided" the person of the deity, then we have to do with an intolerable "heresy" in Judaism, involving the denial of its central tenet of monotheism.)

The Galilaeans are not discussed, but a reference is made to the views of Père Milik that they were Jewish Christians.¹ The only evidence produced for this view is the statement in the recently discovered letter of Bar Cochba that the Jews were to break off all relations with the Galilaeans, with whom they had apparently been previously allied in the war with the Romans. It is improbable in the extreme that Bar Cochba would ever have contracted an alliance with Jewish Christians. We have no reason to doubt that they too were a Jewish schismatic group.

There does not seem to be much to add about the Galilaeans that is not already well-known. Judas the Galilaean (or the Gaulonite) is reputed to have been the founder of the movement. At Acts v, 37, Gamaliel mentions him as the leader of a popular revolt "in the days of the enrolment" (conducted by Quirinius in A.D. 6 or 7), and which ended in his destruction and the dispersion of his followers. The movement appears to have been a considerable one to judge from the frequency of Josephus's references (*Antiq.* XVIII, i, 1, 6; xx, v, 2; *B.J.* II, viii, 1; XVII, 8, 9; VII, viii, 1). Josephus tells us it was from this group the Party of the Zealots arose, but Galilaeans appear to have had a reputation for violent action in even earlier times; a massacre of Galilaeans by Pilate is reported in the Gospels (Luke xiii. 1). The movement deserves much more attention than is given to it in the recent discussion of *Maccabees Zealots and Josephus* of W. R. Farmer (New York, 1956), especially in view of the Gospel

¹ J. T. Milik, "Une inscription et une lettre en araméen christopalestinien", *Revue Biblique*, lx 4, 526 ff.

evidence for the association of Jesus and his disciples with Galilee and Galilaeans.

I shall have something to say about the Hellenians and the Baptists presently : meantime there remain the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

The most extraordinary feature of the list, among other curious things, is not only Justin's omission of the Essenes, especially if he is dependent on Josephus, but his inclusion of the Pharisees in a list of Minim or heretics. The fact is all the more incomprehensible, not only (as Lukyn Williams pointed out ¹) because of the irreproachable orthodoxy of Pharisaism in post-Biblical sources, but in view of what Justin himself has to say later (cxxxvii. 2), where the Pharisees are referred to as the "chiefs of the synagogues", that is to say, as the pillars of orthodox Judaism.

M. Simon meets this difficulty by the suggestion that the term *αἵρεσις* is used in this connection ambiguously by Justin ; it has the later sense of Christian heresy as well as the meaning of Jewish heresy or sect. "Cette équivoque explique une curieuse contradiction de Justin. Il écrit d'un côté : 'Un bon juge ne reconnaîtra pas pour Juifs des Sadducéens, ou ces hérésies similaires . . . des Phariséens et des Baptistes.' Mais comme il a tout de même quelque idée de la situation du judaïsme, il reconnaît un peu plus loin les Phariséens pour ce qu'ils sont en réalité : 'Les didascales pharisiens . . . les chefs des synagogues'" (op. cit. p. 530). In a context, however, where it was important not to misrepresent Judaism, it seems very unlikely that Justin would have brought in the Pharisees, the pillars of orthodox Judaism, just because he himself regarded them as "heretical" from his Christian standpoint.

The simplest solution is to explain the *Φαρισαίων* (as Harnack did ²) as the insertion of a copyist ; it may well be a later gloss (it brings the number up to an even seven) added by a learned scribe familiar with the Gospels.

Simple solutions, however, are not always correct ones. The

¹ Op. cit. p. 171.

² *Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justin's Dialog mit Trypho*, T.U. xxxix (1913), 57.

reading *Φαρισαίων* would seem to be an integral element in Justin's original text. The same, however, cannot be claimed for *καί* before *Βαπτιστῶν*; it is a purely conjectural insertion, the original text reading "Pharisees, Baptists". It is possible to take the two words closely together, the second in apposition and qualifying the first; Justin's "sect" may have been one of "baptizing Pharisees". Harnack admits this possibility, but is inclined to consider it an unlikely combination. We are now, however, in a much better position to judge: recent investigations have shown that so extensive was the baptismal cult in Judaism in the first two Christian centuries, in particular in the Diaspora (possibly not uninfluenced by Christian practice and example), that it spread even among the orthodox and into the ranks of the Pharisaic teachers themselves. This situation is reflected for the orthodox Judaism of the period in other passages in Justin's *Dialogue* (xiv. 1, xix. 2). Professor David Daube refers to it and cites instances of the practice among leading Hillelites, some of whom were even prepared to go so far as to accept proselyte baptism as alone that which constituted a convert, a Jew: "Joshua ben Hananiah claimed that baptism alone was sufficient to make even a male gentile Jewish. They did not go quite so far as Paul: they did not deny that it was the duty of a male convert to be circumcized. But they did consider him fully Jewish as soon as he was baptized. It is interesting that their argument was that baptism was the decisive rite in the case of a woman, so it should be the same in that of man."¹ Such views were almost bound to be pronounced heretical. (In this same connection the conjecture should be mentioned that Justin's *Ἑλληνιανῶν* should be read as *Ἑλληλιαλῶν* (from *Ἑλλάηλ*, Hillel; cf. Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 30. 4) and J. C. T. Otto, *Justini Opera*, in *loc.*).

It is not without significance that Justin finds it necessary to apologize at this point for what he has just said: "pray do not be vexed with me as I say all I think" (Williams). He clearly felt it necessary to say this in view of his mention of Pharisees, even heretical Pharisees, in such disrespectable company as the other Minim listed.

¹ *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1956), p. 109.

What about the Sadducees? The identification of Justin's *Σαδδουκαῖοι* with the ancient Sadducees, and their classification as "heretics", raises problems as intractable as the presence of "Pharisees" in such a list, for the ancient Sadducees almost certainly disappeared from the scene with the Temple. I would suggest that the possibility is worthy of serious consideration that what Justin really meant by his heretical "Sadducees" were the Zadokites, the *Bene Zadok* or Qumran Essenes; so far from omitting the Essenes, they would then figure at the top of Justin's list. Obviously the identity of name was bound to lead to confusion, and something of this sort appears to have happened in rabbinical sources as well. When the Rabbis place Saddoukim among the Minim and equate them with the Qaraite Jews, they can only be referring to the Zadokite sect. Maimonides for instance, tells us, in his Commentary on *Pirke Aboth* I, that the Qaraites called themselves Saddoukim, and were known by this name to their rabbis.¹ Arabic sources of the tenth century make a clear distinction between the ancient Sadducees and the Zadokite sect.² This explanation has been given more than once for Ephrem's "Sadducees", whom he connects with John the Baptist.³ (There is no longer any reason for pronouncing Ephrem confused when he speaks of a Jewish sect of Ebionites, for *Ebhjonim* is now well-attested as a name for the Qumran sectarians.⁴)

We conclude then that there is more in Justin's list than a few generalizing descriptions of innocuous tendencies in second-century Judaism: Justin is describing, as he himself tells us, Jewish heretical or sectarian movements, some of them (like the Galilaeans) pre-Christian groups.

M. Simon is on firmer ground when he comes to deal with Hegesippus, though in some respects Hegesippus's list is even more interesting than Justin's. It is quoted in Eusebius's

¹ The Qaraites are described as *istae sectae maledictae haeticorum, et vocabuntur in hisce terris, nempe in Aegypto, Karraei. Nomina autem ipsorum sunt, id est nominantur apud sapientes Tzaducaei et Bejetosae* (cited in Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* s.v. *Qaraites*).

² Cf. S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, i, pp. xviii ff.

³ Cf. J. Thomas, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*, p. 118, n. 2.

⁴ Cf. Thomas, *op. cit.* p. 2, n. 1.

Ecclesiastical History iv. 22: ἦσαν δὲ γινώμαι διάφοροι ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ, ἐν υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ, τῶν κατὰ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· αὐταὶ Εἰσσαῖοι, Γαλιλαῖοι, Ἡμεροβαπτισταί, Μασβωθεοί, Σαμαρεῖται, Σαδδουκαῖοι, Φαρισαῖοι. As with Justin, M. Simon believes that what we have in Hegesippus is not a list of Jewish "heresies", but one of the first patristic catalogues of heresies of the Church; and in this case he is probably right.

Professor Simon has not given a quite accurate rendering of the text: "Il y avait des opinions différentes dans la circoncision parmi les fils d'Israël, contre la tribu de Juda et contre le Christ." The words should be construed: "There used to be (schools of) thought deviating in the Circumcision (I mean among Israelites) from the (school of thought) in the 'tribe' of Judah and Christ, namely Essenes, Galilaean, Hemerobaptists, Masbotheans, Samaritans, Sadducees, Pharisees." The "tribe" of Judah and (of) Christ might be understood to refer to Jews and Christians respectively. In that case Hegesippus is listing "sects" differing in their tenets from orthodox Jews as well as from Christians. The words, however, probably belong together as the description of a single group, namely Hebrew Christians, possibly converts to Christianity from Judaism, to which Hegesippus himself belonged. The Christian Father is then describing, not Jewish "sects" but Jewish groups *à travers une optique chrétienne*. It is not then surprising to find Pharisees and Sadducees in such company, especially as Hegesippus is describing Jewish sects in the past, not, like Justin, heretical Jewish groups in the present. He may well have got his Pharisees and Sadducees from the Gospels or from Josephus.

More important than any of these observations, however, is the interesting fact that a Hebrew Christian, probably a convert from Judaism, can include Samaritans in a list of Israelites. Whatever his source here, in listing the Samaritans as a Jewish "sect", even though he does so from the point of view of a Christian heresiologist, he is taking us back into ancient history.

The one thing that we cannot do, in discussing Jewish "sects" or "heresies" in the Fathers, is to overlook the Samaritans; and to this point I shall return later.

A more positive assessment of the patristic evidence as a whole is to be found in the studies of Père Joseph Thomas, whose book *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie* was published exactly ten years before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹ Thomas carried forward the patristic researches of Brandt and others into the special problem of the existence of a wide-spread Jewish *mouvement baptiste* in Palestine (and beyond) before A.D. 70. It was a movement (Thomas thought) of baptizing non-conformity, as it were, in opposition and conflict with the Pharisaic authorities in Jerusalem, substituting baptizing rites for the observance of Temple sacrifice. With the help of the ancient historians and the testimony of the Fathers, Thomas concludes that such a sectarian movement existed in pockets or splinter-groups from Samaria to Judaea, consisting of sects among the Samaritans—Dositheans, Sabaeans, Gorothenes—of Essenes, in Samaria as well as Judaea, Nasarenes, Masbuthaeans, etc.

So far as the ancient historians are concerned, the existence of a group of Essene sectarians who practised baptizing rites is not in doubt. What is still in question is whether, as Thomas maintains, the main characteristics of this group (or groups) were their baptizing rites as a substitute for Temple sacrifice. The Qumran Essenes were undoubtedly a baptizing cult; and the large and prominent baptisteries in the excavated settlement at Qumran are impressive evidence for the importance of lustrations for the sect. The relation of the group to the Temple and the sacrificial cultus is still a matter of debate (as is the conflicting testimony of Philo and Josephus on the point), but, in general, it is now widely recognized that the Qumran Essenes represented an opposition Party to the established Pharisaic and Sadducean authorities in Jerusalem; important evidence has now come to light in the Qumran texts which shows that, in the matter of the Festival Calendar, these Essenes were out of step with the official Parties. There is no evidence that they were heretics in the usual sense of the term (they did not, for example, reject the central tenet of Jewish monotheism), but they certainly indulged in a very large measure of heteropraxis.

¹ Gembloux, 1935.

The view that the Essenes were not an isolated pocket or "resistance group" within Judaism, but existed in different and diverse but related splinter-groups throughout Palestine, rests mainly on the evidence of the Fathers. Josephus, it is true, tells us that the Essenes were to be found in every town of Palestine,¹ but the impression this statement gives is of the existence in different places of outposts of the same Essene sect. According to Thomas's interpretation of the Fathers, however, this *mouvement baptiste* existed in a whole complex of interrelated but different groups, practising, like the Judæan Essenes, their baptizing cult from Samaria to Judæa.

Prima facie the garbled and disjointed reports of the Fathers do not inspire confidence. The Samaritans were certainly a schismatic group, but there must be genuine doubt, so far as the patristic evidence takes us, about the separate existence of Samaritan sects in pre-Christian times. The Dositheans are probably the most important of the names, and I shall come back to them shortly. The Sabaeans and the Masbotheans are difficult to identify with any actual groups or "sects", and they may have existed as such only in the minds of the Fathers; in both cases we know practically nothing but their names: both names may refer to baptism and the second certainly does, but, as Brandt pointed out, they may be no more than general terms to describe people who practised baptizing rites to excess, representing the Aramaic equivalent names for the Baptistai and Hemerobaptistai of Justin and Hegesippus.² Epiphanius's Gorothenes (Γοροθηνοί) also looks like a generalizing name; I would derive it from the Hebrew *gere 'arayoth* (or its Aramaic equivalent), "the proselytes of the lions", a name applied by the rabbis from 2 Kings xvii. 25 ff. to Samaritan proselytes to Judaism. The Jewish Nasarenes of Epiphanius are generally believed to be an entirely fictitious entity which the Christian Father has invented out of his Jewish-Christian sect of the Nazorenes.

We are thus left with two very broad groupings only, Essenes and Samaritans, as quite certainly pre-Christian schismatics or sectarians.

¹ B.J. ii. 8, 4.

² *Die jüdischen Baptisten*, p. 113.

Do the Fathers add any information to what we already know about the Essenes? For our knowledge of the Samaritans we are mainly dependent on patristic sources; and, in both cases, the star witness is the fourth-century Epiphanius, who has not generally enjoyed a high reputation for reliability.

According to Epiphanius the Essenes were a Samaritan sect, located in Samaria in times before the destruction of Jerusalem. He has no information about Judaeen Essenes on the Dead Sea, a surprising fact if he is dependent on Josephus or Pliny. His Samaritan Essenes agreed, he tells us, in most fundamentals with their Samaritan neighbours, the "Dositheans", "Sabaeans", "Gorothenes", etc.; they disagreed with all of them, and even came to blows at one time with the Gorothenes, while the latter were on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, on the subject of the dates of the festivals. The story of a fight with the Gorothenes supports the rabbinical evidence that these were Samaritan proselytes adhering to Judaism; and it has the ring of truth about it. If we could believe in Epiphanius's Samaritan Essenes as a pre-Christian sect, then these disputes about the calendar would be a link with Judaeen heteropraxis; there would then be at least two closely related groups, Samaritan Essenes and Judaeen Essenes, lined up against Samaritan proselytes and the Jerusalem Jews.

Epiphanius goes on to speak about another 'Jewish' "sect" called Ossenes, living in Trans-Jordan, south of his "Jewish sect" of "Nasarenes". Thomas identifies Epiphanius's Ossenes with Essenes, and suggests that they represented the remnant of the Dead Sea Essenes, who had migrated to Trans-Jordan after the Jewish War. If this is correct, it would explain Epiphanius's ignorance about the Dead Sea Essenes; they no longer existed in his day at Qumran. But in that case he is simply reporting the existence of Jewish groups in his own time; he tells us further that the Ossenes were later merged in other Jewish sects. His reports about Samaritan Essenes may also be correct, but they too may hold only for the period of Epiphanius. Some of the Dead Sea Essenes may have found a refuge in Samaria as well as in Trans-Jordan. The Dositheans are another enigmatic group, though we are not dependent solely

on Epiphanius for information about them.¹ We cannot, however, be certain that they were a pre-Christian group, and, in any case, their close resemblance to the Judæan Essenes suggests that they are the same group in Samaria²; their 'founder' Dositheus is a purely fictitious character, and it may perhaps be suggested that their name, like that of the Boethusians, is connected with the name Essenes (the name Boethusians has been explained as meaning *Beth Essaioi*). Some of their main features as reported by Epiphanius suggest that by the time he came to know them they had become even stricter ascetics than the ancient Essenes; they not only rejected marriage (or at least one group of them), but they were vegetarians—and they also believed in the resurrection.

Thomas's pre-Christian *mouvement baptiste* appears to be disappearing in the light of closer analysis: we are still not beyond the point of having two main schismatic groups only, the Samaritans and the Judæan Essenes, with no demonstrable connection between them.

The question might be left there were it not for two sets of important facts, some of them entirely new. The first is well-known, and I simply propose to draw attention to it and to recent discussion of it.

The origins of Essenism in the ancient tribal asceticism of Israel is declared by one of the most recent authorities on the subject to be in the realm of *starke Möglichkeiten*³. Hilgenfeld traced Essenes to their origin in a Rechabite clan; and this has been thought to have formed the basis of the later Essene order.⁴ Patristic tradition supports the connection: the Abbot Nilus of Ancyra (c. A.D. 490) takes it for well established that the Essenes were descendants of Jonadab ben Rechab.⁵ The reader is further referred to the long discussion on *Rechabiten-Essäer-Ebioniten* in H. J. Schoeps's *Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums*,

¹ For literature on them, see H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 79.

² J. Schousboe, *Les sectes juives de l'Alliance nouvelle aux Pays de Damas et le christianisme naissant* (Copenhagen, 1942), p. 52 ff.

³ H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums* (Tübingen, 1949), p. 252.

⁴ Cf. Schoeps, p. 250.

⁵ *De monastica exercitatione*, 3.

pp. 247 ff. If the Essenes had an ancient Israelite origin, there may be something after all in Epiphanius's tradition about pre-Christian Samaritan Essenes.

More striking evidence is the discovery of a Samaritan Pentateuch in old Hebrew, not Samaritan, script at Qumran ; and this, together with accumulating evidence of affinities between the Qumran Essenes and the Samaritan schismatics,—in language, religious tenets, customs and practice—again points to the existence of a vital link in pre-Christian times between Qumran and Samaria, the Samaritans and the Essenes.

The most characteristic possession of the Samaritans was their special recension of the Pentateuch—the one and only form of Scripture the majority of Samaritans were prepared to accept. A Samaritan recension of the Book of Exodus has now been found at Qumran among the treasures of Cave 4 (4Q Ex.^a).¹ It contains a substantial portion of the text of Exodus vi, 25—xxxvii. 15, extensive enough to show its essential characteristics ; and it contains all the distinctive features of the much fuller Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch—its repetitious style (e.g. in the recounting of the Plague episodes at Exodus viii-ix), its borrowings from Deuteronomy—the Israelite document—(Deuteronomy i. 9-18 in place of Exodus xviii. 25 (?), Deuteronomy v. 24 to follow Exodus xx. 19, both as in the Samaritan Pentateuch), its transpositions and expansions (Exodus vii. 18 followed by an expansion describing the fulfilment of Moses of a command at Exodus vii. 16-18, viii. 19, followed by a similar expansion fulfilling Exodus viii. 16-19, etc. etc.) The scroll is not in the Samaritan script, but in an old Hebrew hand ; and texts in this form of script were apparently being produced in the first and second centuries B.C.

No discovery could make plainer the affinities of the Qumran sectarians, for it is quite certain that no Pharisaic or Judaean group ever possessed or used such a Pentateuch. If such texts were being written at Qumran for use in the first and second centuries B.C., then it was for circulation among Samaritan or affiliated sectarian groups, such as the Qumran Essenes. The

¹ "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran," Patrick Skehan, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 74 (1955), 182 ff.

fact that the document is written in palaeo-Hebrew points to use among Judaeen sectarians.

In addition to the scrolls, recent studies of the Pseudo-Clementines have been underlining the same strong connection between the Samaritans and the Judaeen Essenes.¹

In the study and elucidation of the Qumran texts, Mlle. A. Jaubert has drawn attention to similarities between the Qumran Calendar and that of the Samaritans²; in this respect, like the Samaritans, the Qumran sectarians were at odds with the Pharisees. As striking is the asceticism of these sects, their rejection of marriage (or the imposition of restrictions connected with it), the ritual bath, and their attitude to sacrifice and to the Temple. Such affinities do not oblige us to conclude that the Essenes were Samaritans, but they point to the same general movement of puritanical non-conformity. "One thing is certain", Schechter wrote in his *editio princeps* of the Damascus Document (and the scrolls have reinforced his conclusions), "that we have here to do with a sect decidedly hostile to the bulk of the Jews as represented by the Pharisees. It is a sect equipped with additional sacred books of its own, a calendar of its own, and a set of laws of its own, bearing upon various commandments of the Scriptures. It is at variance with the nation at large in its interpretation of the past, abusing its heroes, as in the case of David. . . ."³ That the Qumran sect looked for a Messiah of Israel points perhaps decisively to the place of its origin.

As we have already seen, the affinities between the Dositheans and the Judaeen Essenes are so close that they seem to be the same sect at different periods in its history. That may still be correct, but, in the light of the new facts, we may require to revise our ideas about the relationship, for the explanation of the connection is not necessarily that a Judaeen sect found its way into Samaria after the Roman War; a Samaritan sect of Essenes may have settled at an earlier period in Judaea; and in that case

¹ R. North, "The Qumran Sadducees", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, xvii, 164 ff.

² Mlle. A. Jaubert, *Revue de l'histoire des Religions*, cxlvi. 140 ff.

³ S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, i. 28.

the Samaritan Essenes or Dositheans have a very long history indeed behind them. Montgomery traced the influences producing the Samaritan Dositheans to the Judaeen Essenes¹: we may have to reverse this and look for the formative influences in Judaeen sectarianism in the ancient religion of Israel, or rather in its remanent descendants in Samaria.

These connections with Samaria and the North certainly point to an origin for Essenism (and Palestinian sectarianism) in the ancient religion of the Northern Kingdom, or, at any rate, in what was left of Israelite religion after the Exile and before the (supposedly) sweeping reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah.

It may be suggested, as a working hypothesis, that this first-century sectarianism is descended from a pre-Ezra type of Hebrew religion, pressed back into the peripheral areas by the Judaism, predominantly Pharisaic, of the Second Temple.

To come back to the patristic evidence: such considerations are important for our estimate of the testimony of the Fathers, and in particular Epiphanius. In his statements about pre-Christian Samaritan Essenes he may have drawn on a genuinely ancient tradition. In that case it is worth looking again at some of his other statements about pre-Christian Jewish sects.²

Special interest attaches to Epiphanius's Jewish sect of the Nasarenes, located by him in the ancient Gilead and Bashan. They display some of the same characteristics as their neighbours, the Dositheans, and, like the Samaritans, had a variant, if not a different, form of Pentateuch from the Jewish Pentateuch. The only other report about such a sect is to be found in Philaster (*Div. her. lib.*, ed. Marx, p. 4) who informs us that they were Nazirites—like Samson, they allowed their hair to grow, and this is the explanation of their name.

The existence of such a sect is denied altogether by Schmidtke,³

¹ *The Samaritans* (Philadelphia, 1907), p. 263.

² For some of the references to Epiphanius in this section I am indebted to my student Miss C. Olds, who is engaged on a special study of this subject.

³ A. Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente zu den Judenchristlichen Evangelien* (T.U., xxxvii, 1), pp. 199 ff. Schmidtke's conclusions and general estimate of the evidence of the Fathers for Jewish "sects" appear to have been widely accepted. The most recent discussion of these problems by Georg Strecker, *Das Judentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (Berlin, 1958 T.U. lxx) follows this line;

followed by Schoeps¹: both regard this section of Epiphanius's work as a parallel elaboration of his account of the Christian Nazorenes (ch. 30, pp. 18 ff.); and, as, according to these scholars, all the reports of Epiphanius about the Nazorenes are secondary material "woven together out of personal knowledge and groundless speculations", no importance at all can be attached to these later fabrications. A less sceptical estimate has been formed by other scholars, such as G. Hölscher² and H. Gressman.³ The debate has assumed importance in view of the claim that this reputed Jewish sect was connected with the description given to the primitive Church in Acts xxiv. 5, as "the sect of the Nazorenes". Some idea of the extent of the literature on the subject may be obtained from a recent discussion of the name by Paul Winter.⁴

Epiphanius appears to be well informed about Nasarenes and Nazorenes; more than once he carefully distinguishes the Jewish sect, which he places before A.D. 70 (there were even survivors in his own day⁵) from the Christian Nazorenes.⁶ The two presbyters at whose request he wrote his *Panarion* came from Coele-Syria where Christian Nazorenes are located and Epiphanius had himself been there.⁷ The contentions of Schmidtke and Schoeps that the earlier Jewish Nasarenes are a fabrication of Epiphanius's imagination, and that his descriptions come from his information about the later Christian sect are not borne out by a comparison of the two passages. One of the main characteristics of the Jewish sect is their rejection of beliefs in fate and astronomy (possibly directed, like similar Sadducaean doctrines, against the Pharisees). There appears to be nothing corresponding to this in Epiphanius's accounts of the Christian sects of Nazorenes or Ebionites. It seems a little

Epiphanius is an untrustworthy witness. Yet Schmidtke did not receive much notice at the time of the appearance of his book; Holl (editor of the *Panarion* in *Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*), referring to Schmidtke's views on the Ebionites, gave as his opinion that "die wilden Aufstellungen von A. Schmidtke (T.U. xxxvii) bleiben überall ausser Betracht" (Epiphanius, *Panarion*, i. 337).

¹ op. cit., p. 14 ff.

² *Urgemeinde und Spätjudentum* (Oslo, 1928).

³ Z.A.W., xliii, 25.

⁴ *New Testament Studies*, iii. 36 ff.

⁵ *Panarion*, 20, 3, 1-2.

⁶ *Ibid.* 19, 5, 7; 24, 6, 1: 30, 1, 3.

⁷ *Ibid.* Introductory Letter, vol. 1, p. 153.

inconsistent to trace this feature of Epiphanius's account of the Nasarenes to the Pseudo-Clementines (Hom. iv. 12), when there is again nothing corresponding in the parallel account of the Nazorenes, from which, *ex hypothesi*, the Nasarenes are derived (cf. Schmidtke, p. 202). The Christian Nazorenes recognized the Law and the Prophets; the Nasarenes accepted parts of the Pentateuch only. The Nasarenes held in special reverence the oak of Mambré (traditionally located in the area of Hebron); there is nothing about this in the accounts of the Nazorenes or Ebionites. The geographical locations do not entirely agree. And their conformity to the general pattern of sectarianism argues further for their existence, thus accounting for much in the later Jewish Christian Palestinian sects.

Some importance must, no doubt, be assigned to the statement of the Elder Pliny (H.N. v. 23, 19) that there was a tetrarchy of Nazerini in Coele Syria. If this is a reference to the same group, then it must have been a large one. The most important recent evidence, however, is contained in a Mandaean text to which attention has been drawn by Dr. Rudolf Macuch.¹ Macuch, on the basis of a critical examination of the text, traces Mandaean origins to the emigration from Palestine about the year A.D. 37 of a Jewish sect of Nasoraeans, obviously baptizing sectarians; they were driven from Palestine by Jewish persecution. (The text mentions the number as 60,000.) Dr. Macuch does not identify the sect further, and in view of the position of John the Baptist in Mandaeism, the Nasoraeans may have been adherents of the Baptism of John. But it is at any rate a pre-Christian group, and, even if this is a Johannite sect, its origins may lie in an earlier sect of Nasarenes. There cannot have been two different sects with this name in pre-Christian Judaism.

Granted such a possibility, who then were these Nasarenes? We do not know what happened to the ancient Israelite institution of the life-long Nazirate, the descendants of Jonadab ben Rechab (2 Kings x. 15; cf. Jer. xxxv). Numbers vi deals with the temporary Nazirate (familiar to us also in the Acts of the Apostles),

¹ *Alter und Heimat des Mandäismus nach neuerschlossenen Quellen*, Th. Ltz., 82, 6.

but there is nothing in the Pentateuch about this more ancient Israelite institution. It is at least arguable that this ancient Israelite asceticism survived into New Testament times in the Samaritan and Jewish sects of the Essenes and Nasarenes. The Nazirates of 1 Maccabees iv. 9, are called Nasaraei in the Old Latin Version.

If this is one possibility, a second is suggested by examination of the name *Νασαραῖοι*: it could be Aramaic, as M. Lidzbarski recognized, meaning "the guardians" or "the keepers".¹ Now this is, of course, how the Samaritans have explained their name, deriving it, not from the name of the original owner of Samaria and his clan, Shemer (1 Kings, xvi. 24), but from *shamar*, "to guard or keep"; and Samaritans explain that they are the guardians and keepers of the (true) Law.² When once the conflict arose between the Jews of the Return and the Samaritans, it would be natural for them later to adopt such an explanation of their name; they were the "keepers" or "guardians" of the true Law and inheritance of Israel.³ The Aramaic equivalent of *Shomerim* is *Naṣarin* or *Naṣarayya*, and, since Samaria was Aramaic-speaking, it would not be surprising to find an Aramaic name either for Samaritans in general or for a sect or group of Samaritans.

On the whole, this explanation has probably most to be said in its favour: it is in keeping with the other names for "sects" in the Fathers, e.g. the Genistai, Gorothenes, Sabaeans and Masbotheans. Like all these, "Nasarenes" is a general name applied to Samaritans or to those who shared their views. The characteristic features of the group as described by Epiphanius also support such a connection, in particular their bowdlerized form of Pentateuch.

If this is the correct explanation, then Epiphanius's reputation can be thus far vindicated that his "heresy" did exist in pre-Christian times; he was referring simply to Samaritans or a group of Samaritans by their Aramaic name. One can understand

¹ For various explanations and derivations, see my *Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1954), pp. 145, and P. Winter, *op. cit.*

² Cf. A. C. Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, p. 318.

³ For a study of the position of the Samaritans at the Return, see especially Adam Welch, *Post-Exilic Judaism*, (Edinburgh, 1935), pp. 17 ff.

better too the use of the term Nazorene in the Gospels both as referring to Jesus and to the early Church: whether the term was derived from Nazareth or not, the opprobrious use made of it suggests that, in the ears of an Aramaic-speaking Jew, *Jesus Naṣara* or the sect of the *Naṣarayya* would at once convey the idea that they were Samaritans, and therefore "heretics" or "schismatics"; and people in Judaea would not always make nice distinctions between Samaritans and Galilaeans. Something of such a tradition is preserved at John viii. 48, ἀπικρεθησαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ Οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἡμεῖς Σαμαρεῖτης εἰ συ . . . ; Jesus goes on to point out who the true "Samaritans" are (v. 51) ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν τηρήσῃ, θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα . . . ("Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man *keep* my saying (doctrine), he shall never see death.")

Such an explanation of the Nasarenes points unequivocally to the origins of these sectarian movements in the remanent Israel of the North.

In conclusion, I would content myself now with the general point that there is more than meets the eye in these patristic accounts. They deserve as careful and exhaustive study as any of the other sources of information at our disposal. If we are prepared to accept their evidence, we are led to a conclusion very close to that of Père Thomas, and I would summarize my two main points briefly as follows:

(1) There is credible patristic evidence for the existence in pre-70 Palestine and beyond of a wide-spread movement of Jewish or para-Jewish non-conformity, characterized by its ascetic or puritanical tendencies and manner of life and its baptizing cult, holding to a different canon of Scripture and different customs from the orthodoxy or orthopraxis of the official Pharisaic-dominated religion of Torah and Temple in Jerusalem. It was a sectarian movement in the proper sense of the term, though its deviation from normative Judaism in the period was probably more in the realm of heteropraxis rather than of heterodoxy.

(2) This movement of "Jewish" sectarianism may represent

the survival into New Testament times of the old pre-Ezra type of Hebrew religion, with a strong ascetic element ; and its puritanism may stem from the ancient asceticism of the religion of Israel. Its *fons et origo* was the Samaritan Schism.

THE *HISTORIA ELIENSIS* AS A SOURCE FOR TWELFTH-CENTURY HISTORY

By E. O. BLAKE, M.A., PH.D.

LECTURER IN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

THE *Historia Eliensis* has long been known as one of the lesser monastic chronicles recording the fortunes of the abbey, and later the bishopric and the cathedral priory, of Ely.¹ In its earliest form its subject matter is neatly divided into three books. The first takes the foundation of St. Etheldreda to its destruction during the Danish invasions. The second covers the history of the abbey, restored by King Edgar and Bishop Ethelwold, to the death of the last abbot, Richard, in 1107 and the third tells of the acts of the first two bishops of Ely, Hervey (1109-31) and Nigel (1133-69). In later versions the *Historia* was continued, with many alterations from its original plan and substance, to the sixteenth century. Deservedly it occupies a humble station in the rank of monastic chronicles. Not particularly distinguished in design or execution and making little attempt to digest its manifold materials, it is little more than a collection of records and memories which bear on the island and church of Ely with a running commentary to expand and explain them.

¹ In the oldest existing manuscript, Trinity College, Cambridge, 0.2.1, fol. 33 the work is called *Historia Eliensis Insule*. It is more commonly referred to as *Liber Eliensis*. The latter title has become familiar through the edition of D. J. Stewart (*Liber Eliensis*, Anglia Christiana Soc., 1848) and the bibliography of C. Gross (*Sources and literature of English History*, 2nd edn., London, 1915, no. 1372). It was applied by M. R. James to Trinity, 0.2.1 (*Descriptive Catalogue of the MSS. in Trinity College, Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1912, iii. 79-82) and taken over by W. Holtzmann (*Papsturkunden in England*, Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse, Dritte Folge, no. 14, 1930-6, ii. 79). References to Books I and II will be cited from Stewart's edition and those to Book III from Trinity, 0.2.1; where chapters of Book III are cited the numbering will refer to that used by Holtzmann's index to Book III (op. cit. ii. 79 ff.) and that in the edition planned for publication by the Royal Historical Society under the title *Liber Eliensis*.

No original draft remains to reveal precisely by what process or in what stages the various materials were adapted to this new form nor have we any "definitive", polished edition of the whole. All we have are remnants of a work continuously or intermittently—as is the habit of monastic chronicles—in the process of composition. There must have been at least one recension earlier than any now extant.¹ The earliest which survives is in a manuscript of the twelfth century, Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. 0.2.1 (Gale), a part of which—dealing with the early years of Bishop Nigel's pontificate—seems in its erasings and marginal additions to show a compiler at work and which was apparently left unfinished. It does not end, as would be expected from a finished design planned to cover the acts of the first two bishops, with the death of Bishop Nigel.² This event is recorded twice without any final flourish³ and is followed by four charters executed during his lifetime after which Book III concludes somewhat abruptly with a *Passio* of St. Thomas Becket.⁴ Nearest to a polished edition comes a manuscript in

¹ In Trinity 0.2.1 the index of chapter headings for Book II, which is written in the same hand as the text preceding and following it, gives a number of chapters in an order different from the order of chapters in the *text*. The index must therefore have been copied without change from an earlier version, while in the text the order was revised.

² That it was so planned is clear from the preface to Book III, fol. 107, "Textus autem libri huius de duorum constat episcoporum, tempore Herevei . . . et Nigelli. . . ."

³ Chapters 137, 138 (fols. 172^v, 173^v).

⁴ The *Passio* is one of the type printed by J. A. Giles as *Passio Quarta (Vita S. Thomae, xv, Patres Ecclesiae Anglicanae, xxxvii. 157-64)* and *Passio Quinta* (ibid. pp. 164-80) and by J. C. Robertson as *No. X (Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, R.S., 1876, iv. 431-41)*. These Passions are in many places identical in phrasing. The Ely *Passio* is an abbreviated version most closely related to *Passio Quinta*, but occasionally following *Passio Quarta* and Robertson *No. X* where these diverge from *Passio Quinta* and from each other. It stands alone in having the first sentence of Giles' *Passio No. X* by the Lambeth Anonymous (op. cit. p. 72; *Passio Quinta* has the *second* sentence, ibid. pp. 164-5.) and in giving a phrase from the middle of the *Vita* by John of Salisbury ("ad modicum . . . protelavit", Robertson, op. cit. ii. 317) and an abbreviated version of its end (ibid., pp. 321-2). All these Passions, apart from one phrase echoing the *Vita* by Benedict ("Sed necdum in ecclesia sua per mensem resedit . . . ei facere debes", ibid. ii. 1), owe most to the *Vita* by Edward Grim and in a few instances the Ely *Passio* is closer to Grim's *Vita* than to the other Passions. Their relationship cannot be adequately established without a thorough

the possession of the Dean and Chapter of Ely—the *Liber Eliensis*—written, as far as the handwriting suggests, in the thirteenth century.¹ But while it retains the form and incorporates the marginal additions of Trinity 0.2.1, it already introduces a number of independent alterations into the text. More radical changes occur in its successors and the plan of the twelfth-century *Historia* is gradually abandoned. Bodleian MS. Laud. misc. 647 is continued to 1290, adds many charters and cuts much of the narrative, especially the miracles, again having no clear-cut end.² Further and more ruthless cuts were made, this time in both charters and narrative, when a new recension appeared about 1388 in the form of a *Chronicon Abbatum et Episcoporum Eliensium*—an edition which was continued from time to time and eventually brought up to 1486.³ The last rough continuation to the time of Bishop Thomas Thirlby's translation from Norwich in 1554 was never transferred to a fair copy.⁴

Even in print the *Historia* has not found a final, comprehensive form. Its seventeenth-century editors were either unable or not prepared to print the whole work.⁵ James Bentham, admirably examination of the manuscript material, but there seems no reason to follow Giles in rejecting the authorship of Edward Grim for *Passio Quinta* (op. cit. p. x) without further evidence.

¹ I am greatly indebted to Professor D. Whitelock for advice on various points connected with the *Historia* and for her loan of a photostat copy of the Ely MS.

² It breaks off after an account of the accession of Bishop William of Louth in 1290.

³ In Brit. Mus., MSS. Cotton, Nero A. xv and xvi the *Chronicon* is taken to 1388 (the translation of Bishop Thomas Arundel to York) in one hand and thereafter continued in snatches to 1486. There are a number of copies: Brit. Mus., MS. Harley 3721 (to 1486); Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 286 (of the bishops only); Lambeth Palace, MS. 448 is a fragment which has been completed from 1373 to 1486 by the addition of fols. 78-91 from the manuscript which is now Brit. Mus., MS. Cotton, Titus A.i pt. ii. The resulting deficiency in Titus A. i was made up to 1435 by five folios taken from the manuscript which is now Bodleian, MS. Laud. misc. 698 which remains incomplete.

⁴ Lambeth Palace, MS. 448, fols. 89-90.

⁵ Leland transcribed parts of the *Chronicon* (*De Rebus Britannicis Collectanea*, ed. T. Hearne, London, 1770, i, pt. ii, 588 ff.). There are a few excerpts in *Monasticon Anglicanum*, ed. R. Dodsworth and W. Dugdale (1655), i, 87 ff.; *Anglia Sacra*, ed. H. Wharton (London, 1691), i, 593 ff. includes the *Chronicon* and a fragment of Book III from Brit. Mus., MS. Cotton, Vespasian A. xix; *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti* ed. L. D'Achery and J. Mabillon (Lutetiae

fitted by his knowledge of the materials to make good this deficiency, preferred to provide in his *History and Antiquities of the Cathedral and Conventual Church of Ely*, published in 1771, what is in content and spirit yet another continuation, and the first—and last—modern edition of the first two books in their twelfth-century form, appearing in 1848, was not based on a critical study of the sources.¹ Book III has never been printed in full. What is no more than a fragment of it from an inferior manuscript was included in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*.² Its documents, taken from a related cartulary, and some of the narrative chapters, taken from a miracle book of the fourteenth century, were added to the Life of St. Etheldreda in the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum*³ and the index of chapter headings with most of the papal letters has been published by W. Holtzmann in the only critical edition of any part of the work.⁴

As a history, distinct from a cartulary or mere catalogue of the routine acts connected with episcopal office, only the twelfth-century version of the *Historia* need be considered. It is a good example of the charter-chronicle being produced in monastic *scriptoria* about this time.⁵ The reason for its production—or at least for the particular time at which it was produced—is connected with the creation of a bishopric at Ely in 1109. When the convent had exchanged abbot for bishop they still considered themselves as the rightful heirs to the privileges

Parisiorum, 1669), ii. 738 ff. prints Book I from Brit. Mus., MS. Cotton, Domitian xv and transcripts of the same manuscript and of Brit. Mus., Cotton Titus A. i, pt. i were used by D. Papebroch who printed Book I, part of Book II, the documents of Books II and III, a Book of Miracles and a tract on the second translation of St. Etheldreda in the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum Junii* (Antwerp, 1707), iv. 489 ff.; T. Gale published a version of Book II based on two manuscripts in his possession, now Trinity, 0.2.1 and 0.2.41 (*Historiae Britanniae . . . Scriptores XV* (Oxford, 1691), pp. 463 ff.).

¹ *Liber Eliensis*. D. J. Stewart used a transcript and rough notes made by H. Petrie which were transferred from among the P.R.O. Transcripts 31.5 to the Secretary of the Anglia Christiana Society.

² Pp. 682 ff.

³ *Acta Sanctorum Junii*, iv. 489 ff.

⁴ *Papsturkunden*, ii. 79-93 and *passim*; cf. C. W. Stubbs, *Historical Memorials of Ely Cathedral* (London, 1897), pp. 58 ff.

⁵ Stewart, p. 95. Cf. G. R. C. Davis, *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain* (London, 1958), p. xiii.

and income of the abbey and saw in the monastic chapter the rightful advisers of the bishop. Their claims involved them in frequent disputes and, when—after Bishop Hervey's division of the abbey lands—they were granted the right to administer their own share of the estates, in dealings with the king's court and missions to Rome.¹ A successful defence of the new priory's privileges demanded a thorough knowledge of the muniments of the old abbey, and a record of them in their historical context would be more useful to those who conducted the priory's affairs than individual documents and cartularies. That this thought was at the back of the chronicler's mind is suggested by the general concern for the rights of the convent which informs the whole work, and it may well be that the *Historia* is a by-product of research in the abbey records directed towards the first major litigation pursued independently by the priory.² To a work intended to sustain the economic and legal status of the priory the Life and Miracles of the patron saint would be no less relevant than charters and privileges. Abbot Richard's translation of St. Etheldreda to his new church in 1106³ no doubt helped to rehabilitate her after the Norman conquest, but it is quite clear that much propaganda was still needed to establish her claims among Bishop Nigel's following and perhaps even to maintain the self-respect of the monks. This general impulse to gather all the materials bearing on the liberty of the Isle and the abbey received a particular stimulus from Bishop Hervey and from a *scriptorium* fired with literary ambitions. Most of the records of early benefactions were written in Anglo-Saxon and at Hervey's command the most important collection—of the benefactions of Bishop Ethelwold—was translated into Latin.⁴ The translator took this opportunity to put the new craze for rhetoric and dialectic to worthier use in the service of the saints. His book now exists in a version written between 1139 and 1140 where it is followed by a *Collectio Privilegiorum* and the *Inquisitio*

¹ The details of this development are set out in my dissertation, *An Edition of Historia Eliensis Book III* (Cambridge University Library).

² The litigation over the right to the manor of Stetchworth (Cambs), *infra*, p. 311.

³ Stewart, pp. 289-98.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 94-5.

Eliensis.¹ In this manuscript we may well have the ancestor and the inspiration of the *Historia*. Only slight use was made of the *Inquisitio*,² but the *Libellus* . . . *Aedelwoldi* and the *Collectio Privilegiorum* make up the core of Book II and part of Book III. The more ambitious form of the *Historia* no doubt owes something to the arrival of the "rhetor" Julian who took shelter at Ely in the bad years of Stephen's reign and there continued a teaching career previously practised at London and across the Channel. It is known that one of his pupils wrote a Life of St. Etheldreda of which the saint herself was miraculously revealed to have been most proud, and the author of the narrative portions of the *Historia* must have learned his vigorous, if unclassical, Latin about this time.³

The value of so comprehensive a work—ranging over some six centuries—cannot be the same for all its parts and of course depends on the date of its composition and the identity of its author. The authorship has been variously, and inconclusively, ascribed to one of two monks of Ely, Thomas and Richard. The name of Thomas occurs in a miracle story which is found both as Chapter 61 in Book III of the *Historia*⁴ and as miracle no. 29 in the *Liber Miraculorum* in Brit. Mus., MS. Cotton, Domitian XV⁵: "quoddam quod contigit miraculum in instanti

¹ Trinity, 0.2.41. The handwriting changes after a letter of Pope Innocent II of April 1139. After this the manuscript was used as a register for further papal correspondence. Two groups of letters follow. The first include one letter of 1140 and six of 1144, all written in the same hand. The second gives letters of 1150 and 1152 written in a hand different from both preceding hands.

² E.g. for evidence of sub-infeudation at Ely "sicut liber terrarum prodit" (Stewart, p. 275).

³ Chapter 93, Trinity 0.2.1, fol. 153, "rhetor quidam Iulianus nomine . . . vir scientia admirabilis, in grammatica nulli secundus quibusque Latinorum preferendus, in opponendis ac rationem reddendis disertissimus . . . Docuit enim grammaticam primo ultra mare et artes quas liberales vocant, philosophiam quoque et rhetoricam in sua civitate Lundonie capite Anglie, atque processu temporis theologiam experientibus monachis sophistico lepore ipsius clarere sermones et dicta scematibus ornata rhetoricis semperque sane dicere inter familiaria colloquia consueverat atque ex his nonnullos decentissime ad scripturas promovit."

⁴ Trinity, 0.2.1, fol. 141.

⁵ Fol. 60. The following notes are based on the introductory remarks in the editions cited above: Stewart, pp. v-viii; Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, i, pp. xxxix ff.; Papebroch in *Acta Sanctorum Junii*, iv, 489; Mabillon, *Acta Sanctorum*, ii. 107; Gale, *Scriptores XV*, pp. 463, 489.

tempore in me ipso Thoma nomine . . . dignum duxi omnibus exponere". Gale, who owned a twelfth-century version of the *Historia* and did not know the Domitian MS., therefore attributed the whole work to Thomas and in this he was followed by Stewart. Wharton, on the other hand, knowing no manuscript of the *Historia* in its twelfth-century form nor Gale's edition which appeared in the same year as his own,¹ found the reference in the Domitian MS. only. Here the miracle book and a tract on the second translation of St. Etheldreda are placed between Books I and II of the *Historia*, while Book III is not given at all.² Wharton deduced that Book II had the same author as Book I from a passage referring forward from Book I to Book II as "sequentis libri".³ He deduced that the miracle book with its reference to the authorship of Thomas must have the same author as both these books on the grounds that a passage in miracle no. 36,⁴ "in libro suo primo de virtutibus ipsius virginis S. Etheldredae edito", clearly refers back to Book I. Books I and II could therefore be attributed to Thomas, while there is no evidence to connect him with Book III. Richard's claim is derived from Book III, where two chapters on the life of Bishop Nigel refer to certain *opuscula* of a monk Richard, "historiarum studiosissimi deserti et eloquentissimi viri".⁵ Also later in the book the phrase occurs: "ad hoc monachus Ricardus auctor huius operis et hanc historiam stilo commendavit".⁶ In view of this evidence Wharton claimed that whoever compiled the third book "omnia ex Ricardi historia desumpsisse agnoscit" and therefore felt himself entitled to print his fragment of Book III under Richard's name. Gale and Stewart go no further than to admit that Thomas was indebted to Richard for some of his material.

In spite of these arguments Thomas of Ely has no strong title to the authorship of the *Historia*. The miracle story in

¹ Wharton nowhere refers to Trinity 0.2.1 nor to the Ely *Liber Eliensis*.

² Book I on fols. 7-31^v; Second Translation on fols. 31^v-5; Book of Miracles on fols. 35-74; Book II on fols. 74-94.

³ Stewart, p. 92.

⁴ MS. Cotton, Domitian xv, fol. 64; also Book III, Chapter 94 (fol. 154).

⁵ Chapter 44 (fol. 126), 45 (fols. 126-6^v).

⁶ Chapter 96 (fol. 155).

which his name appears is unique in style and does not belong intrinsically to either the miracle book or Book III. It is written in an elaborately-rhymed prose, interspersed with indifferent hexameters, quite foreign to the terse sentences of most of the *Historia*. It was probably taken by both from an earlier collection of miracles.¹ The worth of Richard's claim depends mainly on what interpretation we place on the phrase "auctor huius operis". It occurs in a chapter introducing a long process of litigation over the possession of Stetchworth. Bishop Nigel had confirmed the priory's right to the manor against the clerk Henry, son of William, archdeacon of Cambridge, but was forced—after an appeal heard before Archbishop Theobald and Bishop Hilary of Chichester—to reverse his decision :

. . . prenotatorum simul consilio episcoporum atque precepto adversarium illum Henricum monachis inconsultis in possessionem quam petebat de Stevechesworde . . . introduxit. *Ad hoc monachus Ricardus auctor huius operis et hanc historiam stilo commendavit*, causam negotiumque pro ecclesia suscipiens solus ex omnibus restitit . . . et de arbitrio domini pape decidendum appellavit.²

At first sight this could be readily translated: "For this purpose (i.e. conducting the Stetchworth case) the monk Richard, author of this work (i.e. the *Historia* as a whole), wrote also this *historia* (i.e. an account—or brief—of the Stetchworth case), and on the strength of it Richard could be inferred at the most to have written, at the least to have instigated or planned, the three books of the *Historia*." It has on the other hand been plausibly suggested that the *opus* here referred to is no literary work but the business of litigation and appeal to Rome of which Richard was indeed the *auctor* or originator.³ It was he who lodged the appeal and who took the priory's letter to Rome. If this latter interpretation is correct, as I reluctantly suspect it is, it might then be said that the phrase "et hanc historiam stilo commendavit" refers to the *Historia* as a whole. But it is more reasonable to suppose that the demonstratives *hoc*, *huius* and *hanc* all refer to the same object and that the *historia* dealt only with the Stetchworth case.

¹ A similar style appears in a number of miracles appended to the *Life of St. Etheldreda* in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 393.

² Trinity, 0.2.1, fol. 155.

³ I owe this suggestion to Dr. G. R. C. Davis of the British Museum.

The only clear evidence, then, of Richard's contribution to the *Historia* must be sought in the reference to his *opuscula*. The compiler's phrases in chapters 44 and 45, "Pretermitto plurima que in opusculis fratris nostri historiarum studiosissimi deserti et eloquentissimi viri plenius referuntur" and "Hec quidem latius scriberem, sed quoniam in venerabilis iam dicti patris Ricardi opusculis plene inveniuntur ad alia festinamus", make it clear that the compiler is not merely alluding to them but taking extracts from them. They included therefore a full account of Nigel's accession and installation, the subject matter of chapters 44 and 45. The only other matter which can be said with certainty to have been included is the Stetchworth *historia*. But there are traces elsewhere in Book III that a local source was used. The death of Nigel, for instance, is recorded twice and there are verbal similarities which suggest that this is not a case of accidental repetition, but that the related phrases were twice adapted from the same source.¹ Furthermore the chapter in which the bishop's death is mentioned for the second time was originally part of a longer, coherent narrative, parts of which are inserted at other points in the *Historia*² and which was

¹ " . . . ut vix aliquantulum flatus in eo remaneret . . . Ille ut audivit vehementer obstipuit et dixit: 'Indubitanter his fidem adhibeo, nec miror si male nobis contingat, quia in dispendiis semper adtendimus domus huius' . . . Et sedens in ecclesia episcopus oppressus est infirmitate valida" (ch. 137). "Episcopus similiter sedens in eadem ecclesia . . . graviter infirmari cepit vix manente in ipso flatu vite, foris deportatus exanimis, ut qui audit diffidere non debet quod veraciter dominus vindictam reddit in hostibus alme virginis sue Aedeldrede." (ch. 138, fols. 173^v-4).

² It continues an account of St. Etheldreda's vengeance given in chapter 92, which in its turn follows on the narrative split between chapters 73, 78 and 89, where the offences against the saint are described. That these last three chapters belonged to one consecutive narrative seems clear. Chapters 78 and 89 both describe the inroads which Nigel made on the advice of his *familia* into the treasures of his church on the occasions of his visit to Rome in 1143-4 and of his reconciliation with Stephen in 1144/5, and both loans are said to have been covered by the same security—Nigel's grant of the manor of Hadstock to the monks (Trinity, 0.2.1, fols. 145^v-6, 150-50^v). Chapter 73 tells of Nigel's return to Ely in 1141, after he had been driven from the Isle by Stephen, and of his intention to increase the conventual possessions "quod procul dubio fecisset si perversitas suorum id fieri non vetuisset, videlicet Gozelini de Ely, Radulfi dapiferi, Alexandri pincerne, quorum instinctu bona interiorum diripere et possessiones ecclesie coactus est exponere" (ibid. fol. 145). No details of the

concerned mainly with the struggle between the monastic chapter and the bishop's *familia* over the right to advise the bishop and to administer the old abbey lands. The chapters among which this basic narrative is dispersed exhibit a literary style which recalls chapters 44, 45 and 96, the three chapters known to derive from Richard's *opuscula*. Needless to say, we have not much scope in three short chapters for identifying the style of a writer otherwise unknown, especially since he avoids the more complicated constructions. But they display certain stylistic extravagances which, while found elsewhere in the *Historia*, are by no means general throughout.¹ We find some of these characteristics in roughly half the narrative chapters of

alienation of possessions or treasures here referred to follow in this or any chapter before chapter 78 to which it must therefore look forward, "quos sibi ad modum familiares putaverat secrecius convenit, Gozelinum videlicet clericum, Willelmum cognomine monachum, Henricum peregrinum, Radulfum Holof, Alexandrum dapiferum, quibus usus est in omnibus concilio Achitofel in damnis ecclesie accipiat incuntanter admonere satagunt" (ibid. fol. 146). The original connection between chapters 89 and 92 is also evident. They are interrupted by two charters and chapter 92 has to join the break with the introductory phrase: "Et nunc dum stilus in manibus est que de supradictis viris memoranda sunt exaramus" (ibid. fol. 151). This narrative, divided in the *Historia* between chapters 73, 78, 89, 92 and 138 may also originally have been linked with chapters 47, 51, 52 and 53 which in themselves also form a consecutive narrative concerning the malpractices of Nigel's clerk, Ranulf of Salisbury, who administered the bishopric between 1134 and 1137 (ibid. fols. 127-7^v, 132-4). The subject matter is similar, e.g. "Tunc quippe Eliensis ecclesia . . . diabolica invidia carere non potuit . . . Nam ab invidis et malignis, qui res monachorum monachis a sua potestate deiectis dispensare cupiebant, crudelis parabatur delatio". But as the story about Ranulf is the only section of the *Historia* modelled on classical sources (i.e. Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*; the echoes were pointed out to me by Mr. A. E. Douglas, Lecturer in Classics at Southampton University), chapters 47, 51-3 may have formed an independent *opusculum*.

¹ Richard enjoyed a jingle (e.g. "Itaque cara et preclara Eliensis metropolis luxit et elanguit suo orbata presidio a iugo destituta solatio . . . et de more pro pastore in vigiliis, in ieiuniis . . ." (ch. 44, fol. 125^v). He liked to string together a series of main verbs without any form of conjunction and to pile on his epithets (e.g. ". . . cuius honestas totam curiam illustrabat, potestas regebat, largitas extollebat" (ibid. fol. 126); "verba pretendit . . . monita adiungit . . . ferre commonuit . . . devote spondit" (ch. 45, fol. 126); "vir impius, inventor sceleris . . . multipliciter affixit, . . . gravamina intulit . . . contumeliis lacessivit . . . rapere non timuit" (ch. 96, fol. 154^v).

Book III.¹ There are a few instances in Book II² and scarcely any in Book I.³ It is possible that they indicate borrowings from Richard's *opuscula*. Taken by itself the evidence from style is far too slight to warrant any definite conclusion. But there are further considerations which help to promote a plausible speculation. Firstly, it is unlikely that these characteristics of style are merely extravagances which the compiler occasionally allows himself. They occur in the three chapters known to have been taken from Richard and it is the compiler's habit when he uses local sources—with one exception⁴—to retain the wording of the original. Secondly, the subject matter of all the chapters with traces of this style is sufficiently homogenous in content to have formed one or more *opuscula* and it comprises roughly what we would expect Richard's *opuscula* to have contained. He is not likely to have written a work containing nothing but an elaborate account of the accession and installation of Nigel. Moreover, we know that what made him compose the *historia* of the Stetchworth case was the part which he himself played in conducting the appeal at Rome. But when at Rome he did not confine himself to complaints over Stetchworth. At the same time he started an action against Archdeacon William who had usurped the abbey's rights in the Isle.⁵ His preparation for

¹ Especially Chapter 37 (concerning the archdeacon's rights in the Isle), Chapter 39 (Bishop Hervey's attempts to retrieve alienated lands), Chapter 41 (the death of Bishop Hervey), Chapter 82 (Geoffrey de Mandeville's occupation of the Isle in 1144), Chapter 86 (Nigel's reconciliation with Stephen in 1144 or 1145), Chapter 122 (the purchase of the treasurership for Richard Fitz Neal), Chapter 93 (the arrival of the "rhetor" Julian), Chapter 121 (the fate of a priest and associate of Ranulf of Salisbury who neglected the Ely saints).

² Possibly in Chapters 96 and 97 (the invasion of Ely lands by Esgar the Staller and Hugh de Munford) and more probably in the chapters about Abbot Simeon (Chapters 118, 137). It again occurs in Chapter 141 where Abbot Richard refuses to be consecrated by the bishop of Lincoln.

³ The resemblances are slight and appear in a few passages which are not derived from any known *Life* of St. Etheldreda (Stewart, pp. 46, 76, 109).

⁴ The *Gesta Herewardi*, published by C. T. Martin in Gaimar, *L'Estoire des Engles* (ed. Sir T. D. Hardy and C. T. Martin, R. S. 1888), i. 339-404, are paraphrased in Book II, Chapters 104-7 (Stewart, pp. 229-39).

⁵ See the letter of Eugenius III (Chapter 102, fol. 157^v), "presentium lator Ricardus Elyensis monachus ad nostram presentiam veniens conquestus est quod Will' archidiaconus Cantebrigie iniuste consuetudines accepit de ecclesiis insule que ad matrem ecclesiam pertinere noscuntur et gravamina infert".

this case was presumably also written up as a *historia* and from this the relevant chapters in Books II¹ and III² would derive. Not content with these two actions Richard aired the general grievances of his house at Rome in 1150.³ On the analogy of the Stetchworth *historia* these grievances were presumably recorded in writing and would concern the alienations of church lands and the intrusion of the bishop's *familia* into the rightful place of the monastic chapter—subjects which are treated in the chapter reflecting Richard's style. There are therefore grounds for connecting Richard's *opuscula* with those chapters which display the stylistic extravagances noted. That the compiler did not acknowledge the full extent of his debt need not disturb us. He does not acknowledge a similar debt to a Life of St. Etheldreda which is absorbed into Book I nor to the *Libellus . . . Aedelwoldi* used in Book II. The reason why the *opuscula* are expressly referred to in chapters 44 and 45 is probably not because they were the only two chapters derived from them, but because these chapters abbreviated the original and consequently cited the source where a fuller version might be found.

It is, I think, a plausible speculation that the compiler of the *Historia* drew on one or more narrative accounts covering episodes in the careers of Abbots Simeon and Richard⁴ and of Bishops Hervey and—in greater detail—Nigel, composed by the

¹ Chapter 54 (Stewart, p. 170) which includes a letter from Henry of Huntingdon to Prior Alexander regarding the rights exercised in the Isle by Henry's father, Nicholas, as archdeacon of Cambridge. ² Chapters 37 and 96.

³ " . . . de necessariis, de incommotis ecclesie sue cum eo (Eugenius III) contulit et sermonem conquerendo ostendit, maxime quod dignitates atque libertates decise collapseque fuerunt de loco per cupidorum invidorumque detestabilem ingluviem " (Chapter 101, fol. 157^v).

⁴ Abbot Richard would naturally have come within the scope of Richard's researches. See the letter of Eugenius III of either 1150 or 1153 (Chapter 95, fol. 154^v) regarding the alienations of Bishops Hervey and Nigel and Abbot Richard. A concern with Abbot Simeon—except in the matter of church lands—is not so easy to account for. It is difficult to see how Richard could have turned Simeon's fight for independence from the bishop of Lincoln to account against a bishop who was also the head of their house. More probably Richard's concern with the Stetchworth case led him to Simeon. The clerk Henry based his claim on a charter which has not survived and which the monks alleged to be a forgery. But Simeon did issue a charter to Henry's father to confirm the grant of Pampisford and it is more than likely that he did the same for Stetchworth (cf. E. Miller, *The Abbey and Bishopric of Ely*, Cambridge, 1951, p. 280).

energetic historian Richard. His name would lend more authority than an anonymous compilation could enjoy. Not only was he deeply involved in the affairs of the priory, but he can most probably be identified with a subprior of that name¹ and with the Richard who succeeded Salomon as prior of Ely in 1177.² Speculation apart, we can conclude more certainly that the *Historia* was compiled by a monk of Ely of whose life nothing is known. For Book III he used Richard's *historia* of the Stetchworth case and the same author's notes on some parts of Bishop Nigel's life. He used also an account of the administration of the clerk Ranulf of Salisbury and of the activities of Nigel's *familia*. But, even without any immoderate attributions to Richard, for the episcopate of Bishop Nigel at least the *Historia* ranks as a contemporary account. The time of writing, it is true, is nowhere clearly stated. All we know of the date of Book I is that there was some delay between its completion and the writing of the proem to Book II.³ Book II, as it stands in Trinity 0.2.1 cannot have been finished before 1144⁴ and probably not before 1150.⁵ Book III was completed after

¹ A subprior Richard was one of the party which represented the monks at the election of Geoffrey Ridel (MS. Cotton, Titus A. i, fol. 54^v).

² James Bentham, *History and Antiquities . . . of Ely* (2nd edn., Norwich, 1812), i. 216-17. He should not be identified with the Richard who wrote the *Gesta Herewardi* who must have been dead by the time that Book II was copied into Trinity, 0.2.1. See the reference to him in Book II: "in libro autem de ipsius gestis Herewardi dudum a venerabili viro et doctissimo fratre nostro *beatae memoriae* Ricardo edito" (Stewart, p. 239). The Richard of the Stetchworth case, although mentioned *later* in Trinity, 0.2.1 is nowhere referred to as "*beatae memoriae*". The Prior Richard is said to have been succeeded not before 1189 (Bentham, op. cit. p. 217) and his successor Robert Longchamp does not occur before 1194 (Ely Diocesan Registry, Liber M, p. 318). Cf. *D.N.B.* under Thomas and Richard of Ely; also F. Liebermann, *Über Ostenglische Geschichtsquellen des 12 13 und 14 Jahrhunderts*, Neues Archiv, etc., xviii, no. 10.

³ Stewart, p. 95.

⁴ Chapter 54 mentions a silver cross made by the *praepositus* Leo "quam Nigellus episcopus tulit" (Stewart, p. 168). This cross is listed as one of those broken by Nigel (Book III, Chapter 50, fol. 129^v) and these same crosses are listed again later among those treasures removed by Nigel to help towards the payment of a fine to Stephen when peace was made between them in 1144 or 1145 (fol. 150).

⁵ When the issue raised in Henry of Huntingdon's letter (Stewart, p. 170) was aired before the papal curia (Trinity, 0.2.1, fol. 157^v). Cf. *Papsturkunden*, ii, no. 65. Chapter 54 must have been written before 1155 when Henry had been succeeded as archdeacon of Huntingdon.

1169, when Nigel died,¹ and, as no mention is made of his successor Geoffrey Ridel, before 1174.² Within this period the *Passio* of Archbishop Thomas could have become available.³

In any study of the contribution of the *Historia* to political and monastic history a clear distinction must therefore be made between the first two and the third book. All books are patch-works of local materials, set in a historical framework and interconnected by the compiler's own narrative commentary. But in Books I and II our interests must lie primarily in the materials themselves, many of which have survived and are more profitably studied in an earlier form, while the historical framework presents little that is new, being taken largely from Bede and Florence of Worcester, and the narrative commentary adds little except fluency and sometimes even error. In Book III on the other hand the narrative commentary itself, being contemporary with the events mentioned in the materials used, deserves our attention; the historical framework cannot be traced back to any known source, and the *opuscula* from which most of the interesting matter is excerpted are not available for study except in the *Historia* itself.

Our first reaction may be to congratulate ourselves on the survival in Book III of the *Historia* of a contemporary account of English history between 1109 and 1169 as it affected the Isle and priory of Ely and particularly of the accession, capture and restoration of Stephen, of the not inconsiderable part played by Bishop Nigel *in tempore guerre*, and not least of the making of a cathedral

¹ Note the phrase "Tempore adhuc superstitis domini Nigelli episcopi" as early as chapter 57 (fol. 136^v).

² This is corroborated by the kalendar which precedes the *Historia* in Trinity, O.2.1. It gives the *obit* for Nigel, but not for Geoffrey Ridel. Cf. F. Wormald, *Benedictine Kalendars after 1100* (Henry Bradshaw Soc. Publications, 1939), ii; also B. Dickins, "The Day of Byrhtnoth's Death and Other Obits from a Twelfth-Century Ely Kalendar" (*Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages*, no. 6), p. 15.

³ According to the arguments put forward by E. Walberg all the Lives used in the Ely *Passio* were written before 1174 (*La Tradition Hagiographique*, Paris, 1929, pp. 133-4). That Ely would show an immediate interest in the martyrdom is clear from the report that the prior of Ely visited Canterbury a few days after the murder "asserens se, cum esset Rotomacie, nimium in aere rumorem (ruborem?) vidisse" on the day of the murder (Robertson, *Passio X*, op. cit. p. 441).

priory at Ely. It is therefore disappointing that in the accuracy and significance of the information conveyed the book falls short of its promise. Unfortunately for the student of political history, of its two main subjects the less indispensable—describing the manner in which the monks of Ely adapted the economy and administration of their house to its new status—is treated adequately, while the other, which promises to fill in gaps in our knowledge of Bishop Nigel's early years and to provide a commentary on the activities of the family of Bishop Roger of Salisbury at the beginning of Stephen's reign, is neglected. Out of twenty years of continuous activity in politics and war the author of the *opuscula* seems to have recorded, or at least the compiler to have excerpted, only a few incidents. In these excerpts the historical narrative aims no higher than at a fluent recital of events, and judgement of character does not exceed the conventional appraisal: blessed are the benefactors of St. Etheldreda. The bishop's personality nowhere emerges. Perhaps more serious than the regret at what has been left out is a certain suspicion which attends much of what has been put in. There are instances where the compiler in his attempt to correlate the appropriate documents to the narrative account which he used as his source has upset the chronological order and the sense of the narrative itself. Elsewhere it is doubtful how far the author of the *opuscula* himself was aware of the motives behind and the significance of incidents of which information had come to his ears. The compiler's errors can often be put right. The author's speculations on the other hand can neither be fully substantiated nor utterly rejected. The value of his references to the career of Bishop Nigel depends therefore on the degree to which we can recover from the author's interpretation the events which give rise to it.

A good example of both the difficulties attached to an examination to this end and the benefit to be derived from it is afforded by the account of an insurrection prepared at Ely some time after the death of Henry I. Bishop Nigel, we are told, soon after his accession had entrusted the care of his bishopric to the clerk and ex-monk of Glastonbury, Ranulf of Salisbury.¹

¹ Trinity, O.2.1, fols. 127-7^v.

Ranulf gradually managed to make the bishop impatient of the monks' interference especially in the administration of the possessions of the cathedral church. The lands set aside for the upkeep of the monks by Bishop Hervey were taken away from them.¹ Prior William was deposed and the convent proceeded to exist at the mercy of Ranulf. The chronicler accuses him, "*nostri temporis Catilina*", of aspiring to the kingdom. He gathered round him, apart from two close associates, Henry Peregrinus and Ralph Burgundio,² a host of wastrels and debtors, criminals and fugitives from justice. At a meeting held in Stretham church oaths were taken to the general destruction of all *francigenae* including the bishop himself. Ely became an armed camp and Stretham an arsenal. Ranulf

de fatuo insanus factus cepit regnum disponere,
regem futurum designare, episcopatus et comitatus
distinguere, libertatis ac pacis adversarius quasi
pro libertate et pace leges promulgare.

In the midst of these preparations he lost his nerve and absconded with what he could take with him. Ralph Burgundio, hoping to earn the bishop's pardon, uncovered the plot safely within the sanctuary of St. Etheldreda, who could thus be credited with its miraculous detection. Nigel hurried to Ely and a trial was held. Laymen were hanged, clerks exiled and Ranulf became "as another Cain, a fugitive and a vagabond . . . on the earth".

While not impossible, this story sounds wildly improbable. The only two other chronicles who report it cannot be appealed to for independent confirmation. Ralph of Diceto extracted his information from the *Historia* itself. The wording of his brief summary derives from it and his connection with Ely is amply

¹ Trinity, 0.2.1, fols. 115-16. Cf. Miller, *op. cit.* p. 76.

² Ralph was a member of Bishop Hervey's *familia* (Miller, *op. cit.* p. 171; Ely Dean and Chapter, charter no. 52(2)). Henry Pelryn occurs as a witness to Bishop Nigel's charters (e.g. Brit. Mus., MS. Cotton, Claudius C. xi, fol. 339) and Nigel confirmed his grant of certain fisheries to Thorney abbey (C.U.L., MS. Add. 3020, fol. 171d). He is presumably connected with the William Pelryn enfeoffed in the fee of Littlebury by Bishop Hervey (Miller, *op. cit.* p. 171, n. 4). My knowledge of the Ely muniments owes much to the advice of Mr. E. Miller who placed his collection of Bishop Nigel's charters at my disposal.

attested.¹ The other account of it, given by Orderic Vitalis, while no mere summary of the *Historia*, is clearly in some way related. He speaks of a conspiracy to kill all Normans on a certain day. This was revealed to Bishop Nigel by some of the conspirators, who are not named. Detection and punishment follows except for those who had already fled and gone into voluntary exile. So far Orderic's description accords with the information and to some degree echoes the wording of the *Historia*. But for him the conspiracy was not peculiar to Ely—which is not mentioned—but general, with the over-all objective to surrender the *regni principatum* to the Scots. It was not quelled by Nigel single-handed, but reported by him to other magnates and royal officials. It was not confined to the bishop's men in the Isle, but there were more powerful conspirators who allied themselves with the Scots, Welsh and others and were determined to fight it out.² Both wording and content suggests that this account is built round a report of the rising at Ely. Orderic and his abbey had their contact with the monasteries of the fenland. Abbot Warin of St. Evroul, when a visitor at Thorney, a house dependent on Ely, had at Bishop Hervey's request composed a miracle story which found its way into both the *Historia* and Orderic's history.³ Orderic himself had spent some time at Crowland.⁴ It seems as though he had before him some information which the compiler of the *Historia* also used and to which he added what appeared to him relevant facts from other sources. Orderic does not therefore so much corroborate the *Historia* as represent the same tradition current at Ely.

Without outside confirmation what reliance are we to place on this local legend? How accurately can we expect the author of the *opusculum* adapted by the compiler to report happenings in the Isle and to reflect the inner counsels of the bishop and his *familia*? He was on the spot, writing soon after the event and either, it seems, from personal recollection or recording the

¹ *Opera Historica* (ed. W. Stubbs, R.S., 1876), i. 252-3. For his connection with Richard Fitz Neal who was brought up at Ely and with William Longchamp, bishop of Ely, see *ibid.* i. 248 and introduction, pp. viii-xvi, xxxi-ii, xciv.

² *Historia Ecclesiastica* (ed. Le Prévost, Paris, 1885), v. 91 ff.

³ *Ibid.* iii. 122.

⁴ D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England* (Cambridge, 1949), p. 184.

confession of Ralph Burgundio. On the other hand, he would be subject to the local chronicler's tendency to exaggerate the importance of local excitements and this tendency would find further outlet in the form in which the narrative is presented. It is modelled fairly closely on small sections of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* and his choice of expression may owe more to the language of his model than to the nature of the events which actually occurred. Similarly, to enhance the merit of St. Etheldreda, whose detective work was given the status of a miracle, it would be essential to make the offence one fully worthy of her intervention. Of the bishop's designs and ambitions in the wider field of "national" politics the author's knowledge would be less and the danger of misrepresentation proportionately greater and even where this knowledge must have been more substantial—as of the bishop's plans for the administration of the lands and liberty of Ely—we must not expect them to be assessed on their merits so much as judged by the effect which they had on the monastic community and by the degree to which their resentment at losing full control of the lands and rights enjoyed by the abbey before 1109 and at losing their place in the bishop's counsels to his *familia* was aroused.

There is fortunately a certain amount of factual information and documentary evidence which helps to expose the extent of bias and exaggeration employed. We can, for instance, establish the date of the alleged insurrection. Ralph of Diceto inserted it under the year 1139, but only because he found it convenient to add it to another incident concerning Nigel which did happen in that year.¹ The *Historia* does not give the year but states that the "affliction of the monks" lasted two years beginning and ending on the Vigil of St. Leonard (5 November). The beginning must be the day when Ranulf took over the possessions of the priory and the end when St. Etheldreda detected the plot. The place assigned to the event in the *Historia* suggests that it began about the time of the death of Henry I. Orderic includes it in a series of rebellions which obliged Stephen to return from Normandy in Advent 1137.² The *Historia*'s "biennium" would therefore last from 5 November 1135 to the same date in

¹ Op. cit. i. 252.

² Op. cit. v. 91.

1137. We know further of certain aspects of Bishop Nigel's administration during this period which may have given rise to some of the incidents interpreted here as part of a general insurrection. Ranulf was probably appointed about January 1134 when both he and Nigel were present at Ely and witnessed an inventory of the treasures of the cathedral church.¹ This stock-taking was accompanied by a check of the resources of the bishopric ending in a plea for the reclamation of alienated lands and followed by the establishment of additional knights' fees.² It is presumably this policy which was resisted by the prior who was deposed and by the chapter which were deprived of the management of even the monastic share of the Ely lands. By November 1137 Ranulf had been dismissed and sometime before the spring of 1139 the bishop had confirmed and increased the monks' endowment.³ The dramatic conspiracy may thus resolve itself into the dull prose of a domestic dispute. The muster of Ranulf's associates may be no more than a rhetorical description of the new enfeoffments and the oath taken at Stretham no more than the customary swearing of fealty. It may be that Ranulf used the opportunity to promote his own rather than the bishop's profit. It may be that the carving out of knights' fees caused disputed claims to possession or even forcible eviction⁴ which, promptly adjusted by Nigel, left no mark on the records but furnished enough material for the monks to raise doubts in Nigel's mind of the competence and loyalty of his procurator. But on the whole it seems too big a jump, even for a partisan chronicler, from these domestic differences to the wild talk of wholesale slaughter and something more perturbing must have been afoot. What this background knowledge more certainly suggests is that—whatever excesses Ranulf may have indulged, for which he was to be dismissed—the mobilization of the

¹ Trinity, 0.2.1, fol. 128^v.

² Miller, *op. cit.* pp. 167, 172-3.

³ His grant is confirmed in a privilege of Innocent II of that year.

⁴ Cf. the later dispute over Stetchworth where the claimant Henry "armata manu ecclesie nostre monach(um) inde abiecit, eandem villam nobis violenter abstulit" (Trinity, 0.2.1, fol. 158), having previously resorted to "predationes possessionum nostrarum et post . . . combustiones domorum nostrarum et bladi nostri" (fol. 155).

resources of the bishopric and the marshalling of new knights was the policy not of the clerk but of his bishop and that in their determination to ascribe all possible improprieties to the clerk the monks fastened on to a congenial interpretation which distorts the real motive behind the activities which they witnessed or heard by report. It is of course possible that Ranulf did break with his bishop and that when Nigel acclaimed Stephen at the Easter court of 1136 the loyalty of his clerk remained with the Empress. The occasion of the rising might have been the false report of Stephen's death later in the same year and the threatened destruction of the *francigenae* could have been directed at the leading men of the kingdom. But there are difficulties. So great a scheme is unlikely to have been planned by men so little and it is particularly remarkable that the three rebels who are mentioned by name have no reason to be hostile to their bishop. Ranulf had been worthy to have charge of the see for several years. Ralph Burgundio had been a member of Bishop Hervey's *familia* and with some of his colleagues had presumably entered the service of his successor.¹ Henry Peregrinus occurs as witness to Nigel's charters.² In the account of the punishments of the conspirators no names are mentioned except theirs and the account of their fate is not clear enough to give strong support to the allegation that they had plotted against the bishop's life. Ranulf disappears without trace but was apparently not out of pocket. Ralph won the protection of the saint and Henry was to remain active in the bishop's entourage. That Henry remained close enough to the bishop to stand surety for him seven years later in the company of the leading members of the episcopal *familia*³ suggests not so much that he was concerned in a conspiracy against the bishop's life as that he was engaged in some operation under the bishop's orders. Certainly, the responsibility for the alienation of church land of this period "in milites" is later ascribed to Nigel himself⁴ and, independently from the *Historia*, the author of the *Gesta Stephani*, speaking of events in 1139,

¹ Miller, op. cit. p. 171.

² See above, p. 319, n. 2.

³ Trinity, O.2.1, fol. 146.

⁴ When he was appealed to Rome in 1143, *ibid.* fol. 145^v.

tells how Nigel had hired knights qualified and prepared for any crime, words which recall the qualifications of Ranulf's confederates.¹

The obvious conjecture is that preparations for armed insurrection during 1136 or 1137 had been authorized by Bishop Nigel.

What support do other sources lend to this conjecture and how is it to be reconciled with the account in Orderic Vitalis? From 1140 to 1145 Nigel was one of the most consistent supporters of the Empress. His allegiance was not openly declared until he prepared to fortify the Isle against Stephen in the winter of 1139² and until, after the defeat of his knights, he sought the Empress's court at Gloucester.³ But six months earlier he had been with his relatives, the bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln and the chancellor Roger le Poer, accused of complicity in her plans⁴ and in his case the accusations seem well-founded. While the others were seized at the Oxford council in June 1139, he had the foresight to take up quarters at some distance from the king's court which made possible his escape.⁵ It is difficult to see why he should have withdrawn to his uncle's castle of Devizes in preference to his own stronghold at Ely unless in order to secure Devizes against the expected arrival of the Empress. This interpretation would explain both his reluctance to surrender Devizes even at Roger's request and that this

¹ " . . . militibusque ad quodlibet facinus promptis opere et animo expeditis in Ely sua pecunia conductis " (*Gesta Stephani*, ed. K. R. Potter, Nelson Medieval Texts, 1955), pp. 65-6.

² The account in the *Historia* of Nigel's fortification of the Isle and his compact with local magnates for its defence, while possibly referring to 1138 or even earlier, probably applies to 1139 (Trinity, 0.2.1, fols. 142-2^v). The *Gesta Stephani*, p. 56 places Nigel's open insurrection after the death of Roger of Salisbury in December 1139.

³ Fol. 142^v. Cf. *The Chronicle of John of Worcester* (ed. J. R. H. Weaver, Oxford, 1908), p. 59.

⁴ E.g. *Gesta Stephani*, p. 48; William of Malmesbury, *Historia Novella* (ed. K. R. Potter, Nelson Medieval Texts, 1955), p. 31.

⁵ " . . . ut erat animi versutioris agilitatisque expeditionis, celerrime aufugit, et ad castellum, . . . quod Divisa dicebatur, itinere sub festinatione protenso, ad obsistendum regi viriliter se accinxit " (*Gesta Stephani*, p. 52). " Eliensis autem praesul, qui nondum ad curiam regis venerat, sed extra urbem in villa cum parasitis suis hospitatus fuerat, diris rumoribus auditis, quia male sibi conscius erat, ad Divisas . . . confugit . . . et contra regem totis nisibus munire decrevit (Orderic Vitalis, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 120).

reluctance first convinced Stephen of the bishop's guilt.¹ The *Gesta Stephani* suggest that Nigel's plan to move against the king, "quod dudum conceperat", goes back well before 1139. But the wording lacks precision and, as no distinction is made between Nigel's two aims—to hasten the succession of Henry I's offspring and to avenge the humiliation of Bishop Roger, which latter aim cannot have been conceived before June 1139—we may not exploit this suggestion.² Apart from this we have only the speculation that Nigel must have been counted among those "ministeriales" in Henry I's service who could not trust in Stephen's will and power to protect them³ and that Stephen's illness and reported death in 1136⁴ made it not only convenient but necessary for those prominent in the royal service to look to the future.

As for Orderic, the proposed emendation would eliminate the strange assertion that Nigel as late as November 1137, by imposing severe penalties, antagonized the supporters of the Empress—an unequivocal declaration of allegiance which in the uncertainty attending the succession would have been most imprudent and for a man with Nigel's connections improbable. It is not necessary—although a case could be made out—to convict him also of an intrigue with the Scots, because most probably Orderic assembled under one head all the reports

¹ "Salisburyensis episcopus, accepta regis licentia cum nepote suo locutus est, ipsumque multum redarguit quod, seditionem oriri videns, non propriam diocesim repetisset, sed alienas res furibundus divertisset . . . Turgido nepote cum suis asseclis in rebellione pertinaciter persistente et irato rege . . . Fractus itaque antistes Eliensis, cum reliquis complicitibus suis, moerens deditione quievit . . . Non multo post Rogerius praesul mortuus est, et Eliensis publicus hostis totius patriae factus est" (ibid. v. 120). "Audiens vero rex Eliensem episcopum adversum se arma sumpsisse, quae sibi prius dolose et aemulanter suggesta fuerant, vera credebat tantoque in episcopos vehementiori indignatione succensus, ad eorum possidenda municipia totus intendit" (*Gesta Stephani*, p. 52).

² "Audiens episcopus Eliensis avunculum defunctum, quod animo dudum conceperat, adversus regem agere studuit, quatinus et iniurias in avunculum a rege, ut dictum est, irrogatas, in eum quanto nisu posset vindicaret, et regis Henrici filios ad regnum maturius consequendum pro posse adiuvaret" (ibid. p. 65). ³ Ibid. pp. 14-15.

⁴ Cf. Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum* (ed. T. Arnold, R.S., 1879), p. 259, "Iam ergo cepit rabies praedicta Normannorum perjurio et proditione pullulare".

of disaffection in England and wrongly identified the voluntary exiles from Ely with those known to have sought refuge at the Scottish court who were pressing for King David's intervention.¹

In amending the Ely legend to make Nigel responsible for the seditious activities attributed to Ranulf of Salisbury we are clearly moving in the realm not of proof but of probability. The evidence from independent sources is not enough to confirm that Nigel's active support of the Empress goes back as far as 1136: it merely makes the conjecture more tempting, perhaps more plausible. This frustrating uncertainty mars every piece of information on Nigel's public acts which the *Historia* offers. Not one can be accepted without some emendation. Not one fact can be established beyond doubt. With this reservation we can elicit from the *Historia* such items as that Nigel, after personally protesting against his expulsion from Ely at the papal curia in October 1140,² was restored to his see by the authority of the Empress's writ;³ that, after his knights had been a second time defeated, he made his formal peace with Stephen in 1142;⁴ that his attempt to join the Empress for the offensive planned in 1143 was discovered when he fell foul of a party of king's men at Wareham and that, when he was subsequently appealed to Rome, the need to defend himself there cut short his personal contribution to this campaign and in fact marked the end, formally pledged in a second concord in 1144 or 1145, of his active opposition to the king.⁵

¹ E.g. the son of Robert of Bampton and Eustace Fitz John "regis Henrici summum et popularem amicum, aliosque quamplures, qui vel questus gratia vel iustitiae, ut sibi videbatur, defendendae occasione discordiam ambiebant" (*Gesta Stephani*, p. 36).

² A papal letter, dated October, which the compiler wrongly includes among a number of letters procured by a delegation of Ely monks in April 1139, begins "Accepimus autem venerabilem fratrem nostrum Nigellum Elyensem episcopum absque iusticia et ratione expulsum" and must belong to 1140 (Chapter 68, fol. 143^v).

³ Between 2 February and 24 June 1141 (*ibid.* fol. 145).

⁴ *Ibid.* fols. 145-6.

⁵ These points will be treated more fully in the introduction to the projected edition of the *Historia*. Most of them have been discussed by J. H. Round (*Geoffrey de Mandeville*, London, 1892) but his findings cannot always be accepted. Others who have used Book III in manuscript or in Wharton's edition include notably E. Miller, *op. cit.*, James Bentham, *op. cit.*, D. Knowles, *The Monastic*

We must regret that Nigel lacks the biographer whom his long and distinguished career deserved. But it would be improper to censure the Ely historians on that account. They were after all historians, not of the bishop, but of the priory whose memory and interests are far more ably served. Out of the many documents and attendant commentary we can see an administration independent of the bishop arise on the endowment settled on the monks by their first two bishop-abbots. As this was their chief concern—to trace the rights of the cathedral priory from the privileges and customs of the old abbey—they must be excused from noting the episcopate of Nigel primarily for the set-backs and advances in this development and for commenting on him only in his least adequate capacity—as the head of their house.

Order in England and *The Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Becket* (Cambridge, 1951) and E. A. Freeman, *The Norman Conquest* (Oxford, 1876), esp. iv. 476, 480-3, 811.

RELIGIOUS ISSUES IN LATE NINETEENTH-CENTURY AMERICAN NOVELS¹

By WALLACE EVAN DAVIES, A.M., Ph.D.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE late nineteenth century in the United States witnessed what Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger has aptly called "A Critical Period in American Religion".² The crisis actually was a two-fold one. Firstly, there was the loss of faith resulting largely from the challenges of nineteenth-century science. And secondly, there was the question as to how the churches should cope with the new problems of an urban, industrial society. These concerns were not limited to the United States, of course, as was shown by the excellent B.B.C. talks of a decade ago that were later published as *Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians*,³ and in many instances American opinion was much influenced by British thought on these matters.

My specific topic is the way in which these religious controversies were reflected in some of the late nineteenth-century American novels. For this purpose I have arbitrarily selected six books published between 1884 and 1897. Three of them might be called theological novels in that they are concerned with the problem of maintaining religious faith in the modern world. They are *Esther*, by Henry Adams; *John Ward, Preacher*, by Margaret Deland; and *The Damnation of Theron Ware*, by Harold Frederic. The other three deal with the social responsibilities of the churches. They are *Annie Kilburn*, by William Dean Howells; *Murvale Eastman, Christian Socialist*, by Albion W. Tourgée; and *In His Steps*, by Charles M. Sheldon.

None of these novels, it should be pointed out at once, is outstanding in an artistic sense. No professor of American

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 30th of April 1958.

² Arthur Meier Schlesinger, "A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875-1900", *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, lxiv (Boston, 1932), 523-48.

³ *Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians* (London, 1949).

literature would be likely to spend time on any of them in his lectures, and he might not even be familiar with their titles. Nevertheless, they are all significant for the student of American social and intellectual history, and it is from that viewpoint that I shall approach them. Indeed, for the historian second-rate novels often have far more value than first-rate ones, for the mediocre volumes may reflect ordinary contemporary opinion more accurately than do the great works of art.

First let us turn to the books discussing the loss of religious faith. Various influences, mostly European in origin, were undermining religious orthodoxy. These included a revulsion against the harshness of Calvinism, the impact of nineteenth-century geology and biology that can be summed up in the phrase Darwinian evolution, the Germanic Higher Criticism of the authenticity of the Bible, and the knowledge of comparative religion which disclosed the common mythological basis of many faiths, including Christianity. These developments were so disturbing, even painful, to many devout Christians and gave rise to so much talk about "The Conflict Between Science and Religion" that it is hardly surprising to find popular novels of the day discussing them.

The first in time of the three novels selected to illustrate this was Henry Adams's *Esther*, which appeared in 1884. Henry Adams was an intelligent, sensitive, subtle and extremely complicated member of one of America's most distinguished families. Great-grandson of President John Adams, grandson of President John Quincy Adams and son of Charles Francis Adams, American minister to Great Britain during the difficult Civil War period, he himself as a young man taught history for a few years at Harvard University but then, having a comfortable private income, settled in Washington, D.C., and devoted the rest of his life to writing and travel. The tremendous reputation that he has acquired in recent years stems largely from his fascinating autobiography, *The Education of Henry Adams*, now generally regarded as one of the classics of American literature and a landmark in American intellectual history, but his study of the medieval period, *Mont St. Michel and Chartres*, has also won great admiration and his nine-volume *History of the United States*

During the Jefferson and Madison Administrations still ranks high with the historians. In 1880, under the pseudonym of Frances Snow Compton, he published a novel called *Democracy*, which retains considerable interest as a pungent commentary upon the American system of government. Four years later, under the same pseudonym, came *Esther*.

The story centres about St. John's, a newly constructed Episcopalian church on Fifth Avenue in New York City. It is quite typical of the many elaborate edifices (no simpler word will do) which the tremendous increase of wealth and the shift in fashionable residential areas after the Civil War were causing to be built. Adams's description of the handsome glass, the striking murals, the general theatrical air and the society congregation (one almost says audience) is an accurate one. A romance develops between its young minister, the Rev. Stephen Hazard, and Esther Dudley, a wealthy girl with artistic inclinations who is working on the church's decoration. But although Esther is in love with Hazard, she cannot accept his religious ideas and, feeling this would make marriage to a minister insufferable, therefore finally rejects him. On the other hand, neither does she accept her cousin, a scientist named George Strong, who is also in love with her, because, although they are more compatible intellectually, she does not love him the way she does Hazard.

There has often been repeated the comment that Adams made about the novel in a letter in 1891, "I care more for one chapter, or any dozen pages of *Esther*, than for the whole history, including maps and indexes".¹ To some extent this is probably just one of Adams's typically perverse remarks, but it also reflects how much he had based the novel upon actual persons and places that were close to him. Esther herself, it is generally agreed, was modelled upon Adams's own wife, Marian Hooper Adams. Her cousin, the scientist George Strong, seems equally certainly a portrayal of the well-known American geologist Clarence King, who was one of Adams's closest friends. St. John's, with its lavish décor, is reminiscent of the new Trinity Church which

¹ Henry Adams to Elizabeth Cameron, 12 February, 1891 (Newton Arvin, ed., *The Selected Letters of Henry Adams* (New York, 1951), p. 158).

had been erected in Boston in the late 1870s when Adams was living in its immediate neighbourhood. Less clearly, the character of the minister, Stephen Hazard, suggests something of the immensely popular rector of Trinity, Phillips Brooks, who also happened to be Adams's second cousin.¹

Hazard is presented as a High Church Episcopalian whose interests seem as much artistic as strictly religious and whose obvious preference for the company of artists and scientists has aroused suspicions as to his orthodoxy. But actually he is completely orthodox. Adams says of him, "seeing that there was no stopping-place between dogma and negation, he preferred to accept dogma".² In his first sermon at St. John's he shows an awareness of the supposed conflict between science and religion, but argues that religion really has nothing to fear from science, since it is still religion alone that explains the ultimate mystery, the origin of the facts of science. At first he is quite confident that sooner or later he will win Esther to his views.

But there is also a strong streak of feminism in Esther. She refuses to be the kind of woman who would accept certain religious ideas simply because they are her husband's, which basically is exactly what Hazard expects her to be. The precise nature of Esther's objections is never explained in detail, except that she comes from a family which simply seems to have lost all interest in religion. She has obviously been influenced by her father, Mr. William Dudley, who pays for a pew at St. John's because "society needs still that sort of police", though he suspects that on that score "he could get more police for his money by giving to the Roman Catholics".³ But he never attends any services and has considerable contempt for clergymen. Why he feels this way is not clear, though the fact that he comes from an old New England family suggests he has carried the pre-Civil War rational Unitarianism of upper class Boston merchants to its logical sceptical conclusion. Esther's upbringing

¹ Henry Adams, *Esther*, Robert E. Spiller, ed. (New York, 1938), pp. xii-xiii, xvii; Robert A. Hume, *Runaway Star: An Appreciation of Henry Adams* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1951), p. 146; J. C. Levenson, *The Mind and Art of Henry Adams* (Boston, 1957), pp. 200-1; Elizabeth Stevenson, *Henry Adams: A Biography* (New York, 1955), pp. 123-5, 177-9.

² Adams, *Esther*, p. 208.

³ *Ibid.* p. 207.

seems to have been very much like Adams's own, which he describes in his autobiography as follows : " The children reached manhood without knowing religion, and with the certainty that dogma, metaphysics, and abstract philosophy were not worth knowing." ¹

Esther's problem, therefore, is not so much a loss of religious faith as it is an inability to find it. After she becomes engaged to Hazard, she desperately reads a great deal of theology which must have been quite dull going, but she merely finds such concepts as the Trinity, the Atonement, miracles, apostolic succession and the Thirty-nine Articles confusing and incomprehensible, while the physical resurrection of the body strikes her as " a shocking idea ". ²

In her despair she confers with her scientist cousin, George Strong, described as " a full-fledged German Darwinist " ³ who, however, is not a biologist, but a professor of palaeontology " who looked at churches very much as he would have looked at a layer of extinct oysters in a buried mud-bank ". ⁴ But although he is called the " freest of free thinkers ", who is on record as declaring " the whole church a piece of superstition ", ⁵ Strong feels no particular mission to attack the church and indeed would like to ease Esther's path : ⁶

Strong's notion was that since the Church continued to exist, it probably served some necessary purpose in human economy, though he could himself no more understand the good of it than he could comprehend the use of human existence in any shape. Since men and women were here, idiotic and purposeless as they might be, they had what they chose to call a right to amuse themselves in their own way, and if this way made some happy without hurting others, Strong was ready enough to help.

But Esther pushes him : ⁷

" Tell me what you think about religion ! "

Strong drew himself together with a perceptible effort : " I think about it as little as possible," said he.

" Do you believe in a God ? "

" Not in a personal one."

" Or in future rewards and punishments ? "

" Old women's nursery tales ! "

¹ Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams : An Autobiography* (Boston and New York, 1918), p. 35.

² Adams, *Esther*, p. 298.

³ Ibid. p. 207.

⁴ Ibid. p. 219.

⁵ Ibid. pp. 219, 200.

⁶ Ibid. pp. 219-20.

⁷ Ibid. p. 269.

It is typical of Adams's complete scepticism, however, that he refused to place any more faith in science than in religion. When serving as his father's secretary in England, he learned about Darwinism probably considerably before most Americans who were not professional scientists, and also carefully studied Lyell's work in geology, but he never erected these ideas into a new dogma. His comment on Darwinism in his autobiography was just a shade too self-consciously offhand: "He did not even care that it should be proved true, unless the process were new and amusing. He was a Darwinian for fun."¹ Thus Strong also declares, "Mystery for mystery science beats religion all hollow. I can't open my mouth in my lecture-room without repeating ten times as many unintelligible formulas as ever Hazard is forced to do in his church."² He tells Esther, "There is no science which does not begin by requiring you to believe the incredible".³

Finally she asks him point blank: ⁴

"Is science true?"

"No!"

"Then why do you believe in it?"

"I don't believe in it."

Esther does not find much consolation in Strong's argument that a minister's wife does not need to understand miracles any more than a mathematician's wife has to understand the first axiom of Euclid. She at last convinces Hazard of the impossibility of their marriage, after he has pursued her to Niagara Falls, when she exclaims: ⁵

"after a violent struggle with myself, I found I could not enter a church without a feeling of—of hostility. . . . I never saw you conduct a service without feeling as though you were a priest in a Pagan temple, centuries apart from me. At any moment I half expected to see you bring out a goat or ram and sacrifice it on the high altar. How could I, with such ideas, join you at communion?"

In the final analysis, therefore, it was really Esther's knowledge of comparative religion rather than her command of modern science that made belief impossible for her.

Although Adams's earlier anonymous novel, *Democracy*, had caused quite a stir and produced a flurry of speculation as to its

¹ Adams, *Education*, p. 232.

² Adams, *Esther*, p. 191.

³ *Ibid.* p. 199.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 198.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 295-6.

author, *Esther* made almost no impression when it appeared. This was largely because Adams insisted that the publishers try the experiment of giving it no advertising publicity to find out "whether authorship without advertisement was possible" and a book could succeed on merit alone.¹ He soon learned the answer. In less than a year he wrote his publisher, "My experiment has failed. So far as I know, not a man, woman or child has read or heard of *Esther*. . . ." ² Though as usual Adams was exaggerating somewhat, he was close to being literally accurate. Of the 1,000 copies that had been printed, 504 were sold in the first year and then only twenty-three more in the following decade; a few copies of an English edition were sold in 1885. In all, the sales of the book brought in a total of \$326.³ In any case, Adams soon wanted the book practically suppressed. Late in 1885 Mrs. Adams, upon whom *Esther* had been so closely patterned, committed suicide. Shortly after that tragic event he wrote to his intimate friend, John Hay, concerning the novel, "To admit the public would be almost unendurable to me".⁴ Hay was one of the few people to whom he revealed the secret of his authorship; the fact was not generally known, even to some of his closest friends and relatives, until after Adams's death in 1918.⁵

But although of the six novels we are considering *Esther* attracted the least attention at the time, it has since become the best known of them. This is because the years since Adams died have seen a steadily increasing interest in him and in everything he wrote. As a result, in 1938 there came a re-printing of *Esther*, the first since its original publication, and, when the *Literary History of the United States* was published ten years later, the verdict on Adams the novelist was that "for psychological insight and wit in expression he is superior to most of his

¹ Henry Adams to Henry Holt, 8 January, 1885 (Harold Dean Cater, ed., *Henry Adams and His Friends: A Collection of His Unpublished Letters* (Boston, 1947), p. 137).

² Adams to Holt, 6 January, 1885 (ibid. p. 136).

³ Spiller, "Introduction", Adams, *Esther*, pp. xxiv-xxv.

⁴ Henry Adams to John Hay, 23 August, 1886 (Arvin, ed., *Selected Letters*, p. 101).

⁵ Cater, ed., *Henry Adams and His Friends*, p. xvi.

contemporaries".¹ By that time an original edition of *Esther* had become worth \$400.²

But the average reader in the 1880s would have heard far more about another novel, entitled *John Ward, Preacher*, which appeared four years after *Esther* in 1888. Its author, a young woman named Margaret Deland, had been born Margaretta Campbell in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1857, had been raised in the nearby countryside, had studied art in New York City, had taught it there before her marriage to Lorin Deland in 1880 and thereafter spent the rest of her life in or around Boston, Massachusetts. She had already published a volume of verse, but *John Ward, Preacher* was the first of a long series of novels, such as *The Iron Woman* and *The Awakening of Helena Richie*, which were quite popular in their day. A slow, careful worker, her best known stories centred about a character named Dr. Lavendar in a small Pennsylvania village called Old Chester. They were typical examples of the sentimental, nostalgic "local colour" school of writing that was then the vogue, but by the time of her death in 1945 they were largely forgotten, and Mrs. Deland does not receive much attention now from serious students of American literature.³

John Ward, Preacher was so different from Mrs. Deland's subsequent books that it has caused one critic to declare that she "was not a local colour writer, but a disciple of George Eliot, concerned, first of all, with ethical problems".⁴ The theme is similar to that of *Esther*—the conflict between a minister, in this case John Ward, a fanatically orthodox Presbyterian clergyman in a Pennsylvania lumber mill town called Lockhaven, and the woman whom he loves, Helen Jeffrey, who once again does not share his religious convictions.

Helen's tragic mistake is that, unlike *Esther*, she actually marries her minister, and the results are so disastrous as to

¹ Robert E. Spiller et. al., *The Literary History of the United States* (New York, 1948), ii. 1090. ² Hume, *Runaway Star*, p. 142.

³ *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, iii (New York, 1893), 476 and xxxiii (New York, 1947), 506; Stanley J. Kunitz and Howard Haycraft, eds., *Twentieth Century Authors* (New York, 1942), p. 367.

⁴ Edward Wagenknecht, *Cavalcade of the American Novel* (New York, 1952), p. 474.

suggest that Esther made the wiser decision. To be sure, Helen has far more religious faith to begin with than Esther. Raised in a small village by an uncle who was the Episcopalian rector there, she had learned her catechism as a child, was confirmed as a young girl and was a faithful member of the choir ; in short, " a very well-bred and modest young woman, taking her belief for granted, and giving no more thought to the problems of theology than girls usually do ".¹ Indeed, it is too bad she could not have met Esther's Stephen Hazard, for apparently she would have had none of Esther's scruples about accepting his views. But instead she marries John Ward, even though from his viewpoint she is not a Christian but a sinner doomed to eternal damnation. Like Hazard, however, he cannot believe that the power of his religious faith will fail to convert her eventually.

But, although Helen is not especially intellectual and never shows any awareness of the problems posed by Darwinism or comparative religion that presumably proved such stumbling blocks to Esther, she does find the doctrines of a narrowly rigid lower class Presbyterian congregation increasingly repellant. Soon after her arrival in Lockhaven she is horrified to discover her maid singing a hymn with these sentiments : ²

" My thoughts on awful subjects roll,
Damnation and the dead.
What horrors seize the guilty soul,
Upon the dying bed !
" Where endless crowds of sinners lie,
And darkness makes their chains,
Tortured with keen despair they cry,
Yet wait for fiercer pains ! "

She is even more horrified to discover that this is actually sung in her husband's church. Soon Helen is shocking the congregation by what seems to it one heretical opinion after another. She does not believe in original sin, eternal punishment, a literal Hell or a God who is cruel and wicked. She finds all these ideas completely repulsive and obviously does not think belief in any of them is essential for salvation.

The church members are so dismayed at having their minister's wife deny the basic doctrines of the denomination that

¹ Margaret Deland, *John Ward, Preacher* (Boston and New York, 1889), p. 42.

² *Ibid.* pp. 46-7.

they soon inform Ward he must set his house in order. They also complain that he has not been giving as many hell-fire sermons since his marriage as he should. Ward has indeed modified his preaching so as not to antagonize his wife. As he had feared, he only alienates her further when he reverts to a plea for foreign missions as essential to save the heathen from their otherwise inevitable fate of eternal misery.

Helen in her way remains as stubborn as Esther, also refusing to pretend to believe things which she does not. Moreover, when her husband quotes the Bible to her as final authority, she denies its literal inspiration. When finally the church threatens to have her brought up for disciplinary action, Ward orders Helen to leave him and sends her back to her uncle's home. By now Mrs. Deland has got her story into an apparently insoluble deadlock, which she resolves by the convenient device of having Ward die of a mysterious illness.

The fact that Helen's uncle, Dr. Howe, is an Episcopalian minister enables Mrs. Deland also to present a contrast between the Episcopalian and Presbyterian churches. In so doing, presumably she was drawing upon her own childhood experiences. Raised by a paternal uncle who was as strictly Presbyterian as the name Campbell would suggest, on visits to her maternal grandparents she had attended the gentler Episcopalian services. Dr. Howe is presented as an amiable gentleman who drinks sherry, while John Ward is a rabid tee-totaller who, when asked if he would permit liquor to be used to save a life, replies, "Death is better than sin".¹ In his religious views Dr. Howe is conventionally moderate, being neither dogmatic nor questioning. He obviously has strong doubts about the literal interpretation of the Bible and is shocked to learn that Ward preaches that the unconverted are eternally damned, even if it is logical Presbyterian doctrine. This may be consistent, says the rector, "but that doesn't alter the fact that he's a fool to say such things. Let him believe them, if he wants to, but for Heaven's sake let him keep silent! . . . It will be sure to offend the parish, if he consigns people to the lower regions in such a free way."² All

¹ Margaret Deland, *John Ward, Preacher* (Boston and New York, 1889), p. 69.

² *Ibid.*, p. 189.

of which merely shows that he knew his upper class Episcopalian clientèle better than he knew Ward's lower class Presbyterian following.

On the other hand, he is annoyed with his niece for not agreeing with her husband on what he considers relatively unimportant matters which a woman should not discuss anyway. He is horrified when Ward takes these religious differences so seriously as to expel his wife, largely because to have a woman in his family separated from her husband is socially embarrassing. When asked by his sister what explanation he will give of this awkward development, "I'm sure I don't know", he answered impatiently; "anything but the truth".¹

Actually Mrs. Deland has an ambivalent attitude towards both denominations. She feels considerable respect for the strength and integrity of Ward's convictions, coupled with horror for their implications. She is more sympathetic towards Episcopalian mildness, but cannot resist some gently satirical thrusts at its polite indifference to religious dogma and greater concern for maintaining social appearances. When the story ends, the widowed Helen remains with her uncle to take care of him, but she no longer attends church because she finds she has lost all religious faith. Mrs. Deland herself ended up as a Unitarian, in the minds of some people a fate not very different from Helen's.

Although *John Ward, Preacher* attracted far more public attention than *Esther* and has been listed among what Frank Luther Mott calls the "better sellers" of 1888,² it did not have the tremendous success of an English novel of the same year which was also religious in theme and was also an early novel by a young woman who was destined to have a long literary career. This was *Robert Elsmere*, by Mrs. Humphrey Ward, which caused as much of a sensation in the United States as in England and indeed sold even more widely there. When reprinted in America, it promptly went through nine editions and sold some 500,000 copies in the first year and at least a million copies over the following decade.³ The two novels were quite unconnected,

¹ Margaret Deland, *John Ward, Preacher* (Boston and New York, 1889), p. 434.

² Frank Luther Mott, *Golden Multitudes: The Story of Best Sellers in the United States* (New York, 1947), p. 323.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 180-1.

and their simultaneous appearance was entirely accidental, as was also the odd fact that Mrs. Deland's hero had Mrs. Ward's surname.

Actually a rapid examination reveals important differences between them. A superficial contrast is that in Mrs. Ward's book it is the minister who loses his faith and the wife who remains fanatically orthodox, just the reverse of the situation in *John Ward, Preacher*. It would probably be unwise, however, to make too much of the fact that in the American novels it is the women, Esther and Helen, who show inquiring minds and an insistence upon forming their own opinions, unlike the more conventional Englishwoman, Mrs. Elsmere, for the next American novel to be considered will be closer to Mrs. Ward's formula. More important is the difference in intellectual content between the two novels. The far greater intellectual sophistication of Mrs. Ward, a member of the famous Arnold family who knew all the current movements of thought in England, is seen in her complete familiarity with the German Higher Criticism, and this is what undermines Elsmere's belief in miracles and the supernatural basis of Christianity, whereas Mrs. Deland's Helen feels nothing more complex than an intuitive aversion to Calvinist dogma.

The third of our theological novels, *The Damnation of Theron Ware*, which appeared in 1896, is more like *Robert Elsmere* than is *John Ward, Preacher*. The author, Harold Frederic, was a native of upstate New York who became a journalist, ending as the London correspondent of the *New York Times* and therefore living in England for several years before his death in 1898. He wrote several local colour and historical novels which were largely laid in the Mohawk Valley where he had grown up. Unlike Mrs. Deland, he was a rapid writer, at the rate of 4,000 words a day, often sending the rough drafts directly to the printer.¹

In *The Damnation of Theron Ware*, the most important of his books, he turned to the religious life of the same area of upstate New York.² Having so far learned something about Episcopalianism in both New York City and a small village and about

¹ "Harold Frederic", *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1928-58), vii. 7.

² As far as his own beliefs were concerned, he is said to have become an ardent Christian Scientist, or at least was sufficiently under the influence of the doctrine that inadequate medical attention in his final illness was felt to have

Presbyterianism in a mill town, with this novel we turn to a scathingly realistic description of Methodism in Octavius, New York, located in the midst of that countryside near Utica, Syracuse and Ithaca which still startles foreign visitors with its incongruous classical place names, to which Theron Ware has just come as the new minister. Frederic is said to have engaged in careful research on the Methodists before writing,¹ and certainly every unattractive detail is there. There is a description of a camp meeting, nine days of primitive Wesleyanism, and of the unsavory happenings among the visiting crowds on dark summer nights. There is a description of a love-feast with its singing, praying and Amens. There is a description of the hysterical atmosphere of a revival meeting, leading to the rush of penitent sinners to the altar rail. There is a description of the unscrupulous methods used by two professional fund raisers of more than dubious antecedents, who are brought in to end the church's deficit. There is a description of the hymn singing at a prayer meeting as heard by the minister next door : ²

Through two wooden walls he could detect the conceited and pushing note of Brother Lovejoy, who tried always to drown the rest out, and the lifeless, unmeasured weight of shrill clamor which Sister Barnum hurled into every chorus, half closing her eyes and sticking out her chin as she did so.

There are the "Licensed Exhorters—an uncouth crew, with country store-keepers and lumbermen and even a horse doctor among their number . . .".³

And above all there is a picture of the small town penny-pinching narrowness and intolerance of the Methodists, such as the opposition to allowing street cars to run on Sundays and the distinction between going to a menagerie to see the animals, which is educational, and going to a circus, whose women in tights make it evil. Soon after their arrival in Octavius the Wares learn that the church trustees will not allow milk to be delivered to the minister's home on Sundays, and Mrs. Ware is

contributed to his comparatively youthful death. (Ibid.; *Daily Telegraph* (London), 27 October, 1898).

¹ Everett Carter, *Howells and the Age of Realism* (Philadelphia and New York, 1950), p. 244.

² Harold Frederic, *The Damnation of Theron Ware* (Chicago, 1896), p. 196.

³ Ibid. p. 10.

instructed to take the flowers off her bonnet. And there is Brother Pierce's injunction to Theron as to the kind of preaching the members expected : ¹

" We don't want no book-learnin' or dictionary words in our pulpit. . . . What we want here, sir, is straight-out, flatfooted hell—the burnin' lake o' fire an' brimstone. Pour it into 'em, hot an' strong. We can't have too much of it. Work in them awful deathbeds of Voltaire an' Tom Paine, with the Devil right there in the room, reachin' for 'em, an' they yellin' for fright ; that's what fills the anxious seats an' brings in souls hand over fist."

It is a realistic exposé of small town life that obviously anticipated the work of Sinclair Lewis a quarter of a century later in *Main Street* and *Elmer Gantry*, even to the ugly names of characters like Erastus Winch, and it is significant that Lewis was familiar with the book.²

To be sure, Frederic makes it clear that the church in Octavius was considered a reactionary survival of primitive Methodism even by other devout members of the denomination, but the young Rev. Theron Ware, when he first arrives from a slightly more enlightened parish, is himself no paragon of social polish or intellectual breadth. He has almost no knowledge of music or literature, he cannot read any foreign languages, he thinks George Sand was a man and he does not recognize what an electric door bell is the first time he encounters one. His meagre library consists almost entirely of volumes like *Bible Lands, Rivers and Lakes of the Scriptures* and *Bible Manners and Customs*. His success as a minister is obviously not because of any intellectual leadership or, as it turns out, even any great spiritual integrity, but because of an oratorical skill in the pulpit that is largely emotional and rhetorical.

Theron's religious downfall begins in the same fashion as Robert Elsmere's. He decides to write a book, a fatal decision, as in each case it soon reveals what little knowledge the minister actually has and how much he has simply taken second-hand information for granted without ever questioning it. But now Theron falls under certain new influences which, in his opinion, lead to his intellectual emancipation.

¹ Harold Frederick, *The Damnation of Theron Ware* (Chicago, 1896), pp. 43-4.

² Sinclair Lewis, *Main Street*, (London, 1923), p. 70.

The first of these is Catholicism. Although the Roman Catholic Church by now had become a major religious denomination in the United States, it receives little attention in most of the religious novels of the period, which were written by persons of Protestant background who had scant knowledge of or sympathy for this development in American life. But, in addition to his blistering description of Methodism, Frederic gives a careful and understanding picture of the local Irish Catholic community, which now has the largest church in town, with an especially lively account of a Catholic picnic with all its beer drinking.

He also indicates clearly all the prejudices a person of Theron's background automatically has against Irish Catholics. But then Theron accidentally stumbles onto the death-bed scene of an Irish labourer, and, obviously witnessing Catholic ritual for the first time, is impressed by its beauty. Through this episode he meets the local priest, Father Forbes, based on an actual Modernist Catholic priest whom Frederic had known in Utica, New York, and is even more startled to hear from him a highly sophisticated account of the origin of supreme unction. From further association with Father Forbes Theron acquires an introduction not only to comparative religion, with lectures on the similarities between Biblical and ancient Irish mythology, but also to such niceties of life as eating dinner in the evening, fine cooking, wine drinking and smoking, all of this occurring in luxuriously furnished rooms lined with more books than Theron has ever seen in a private home.

Through the priest Theron also meets a physician, Dr. Ledsmar, who has written a book on serpent worship, grows orchids in a conservatory in order to test some of Darwin's theories and experiments with feeding opium to a Chinese manservant. Next we find Theron reading Renan, Lecky, John W. Draper and Robert G. Ingersoll and rapidly losing his original simple faith.

All this is quite heady stuff for Theron, but even more educational are his contacts with an exotic red-headed Irish Catholic heiress named Celia Madden, who expresses the sort of *fin-de-siècle* cult of art for art's sake that made reading the *Yellow Book* so racy in the 1890s. She emphasizes the Greek pagan

elements in Christianity, smokes cigarettes and plays Chopin late at night in her studio for Theron while he lounges upon cushions, drinking benedictine, amidst a profusion of draperies, rugs, divans, naked statues and peacock-blue leather walls. At such moments Frederic's usual realism deserts him entirely, and Celia seems to anticipate not so much a character in Sinclair Lewis as the late Miss Theda Bara.

It is a tribute to Frederic's subtlety that for a long time the reader shares Theron's conviction that the provincial minister is undergoing an admirable intellectual broadening like that of Robert Elsmere, but eventually it becomes apparent that Theron is not a person of Elmere's integrity and that we are actually witnessing the disintegration of a shallow, egotistical individual. Various episodes disclose Theron's basic cheapness and moral cowardice. The climax comes when, on the basis of one slight kiss from Celia, he pursues her to New York, assuming that she understands him much better than the unsophisticated wife whom he now constantly disparages as being no longer his intellectual equal. But when Celia rejects him, Theron has a complete collapse and is put back on his feet only by the devoted care and common sense advice of the two Methodist fund raisers mentioned earlier, who turn out to be the most interesting and admirable characters in the book. At the end Theron, reunited with his wife, has left the ministry and is headed for a new life in Seattle, on the west coast of the United States, with an ominous indication that he intends to turn his showy brand of rhetoric to a political career. Senator Theron Ware of Washington, we fear, is not too far off.

The book is nearly always described as having caused a "sensation",¹ though it never seems to have become a best-seller. It was also published in England in the same year under the title of *Illumination* and apparently caused a similar stir, largely, one suspects, as an exposé of life among the strange Americans. Thus the *Pall Mall Gazette* observed, "Mr. Frederic's picture of the ideas and habits of this backwoods

¹ William Peterfield Trent et. al., *The Cambridge History of American Literature* (New York, 1947), iii. 92; Spiller, *Literary History*, i. 635; Grant C. Knight, *The Critical Period in American Literature* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1951), p. 107. This is varied by the *DAB*'s terming it a "succès de scandale", vii. 7.

Methodist community is a revelation", while the *Morning Post* described it as "full of pictures of ways of life with which we on this side of the Atlantic are not familiar". Mr. Gladstone hailed it as "a masterpiece of character drawing".¹

Over the years the novel has maintained its reputation as a minor classic. In *Main Street*, noted for its detailed realism, the heroine, Carol Kennicott, discusses the novel with the local French and English teacher, and we can take the word of Sinclair Lewis that it was exactly the book that the would-be intelligentsia in a small Minnesota town in the early 1900s would have been reading.² In more recent years it has been acclaimed, with considerable exaggeration, as being "among the four or five best novels written by an American during the nineteenth century".³ Perhaps the greatest proof of its continued appeal came in 1951, when a character in a detective story named Thereon [sic] explained that he was so called "because my mother had just read a book about someone called Thereon Ware".⁴ In view of Theron's record, it seems an odd choice, though it turns out to be an appropriate one for this particular person.

In addition to the problem of the loss of faith, the other major religious issue of the late nineteenth century was the churches' adjustment to the new social and economic problems posed by the rise of industry and urbanism. The most disturbing of these developments were the spread of monopolies, the elimination of small businessmen, often by unfair methods of competition, the increasing inequalities of wealth, with great fortunes concentrated in a few hands as contrasted to the deep poverty of masses of people, the growth of urban slums, recurrent unemployment and the series of violent strikes that announced the emergence of sharp capital-labour antagonism.

With all this went a suspicion that the churches had identified themselves too much with the employer class and hence had become too conservative in their outlook, upholding *laissez-faire*

¹ See the excerpts from various British publications quoted at the beginning of the English edition, Harold Frederic, *Illumination* (London, 1896).

² Lewis, *Main Street*, p. 70.

³ Carter, *Howells and the Age of Realism*, p. 239.

⁴ Helen McCloy, *Alias Basil Willing* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1957), p. 58.

and individualism, opposing labour organizations and reform efforts and neglecting the problems of the poor.¹ A conspicuous demonstration of this class alignment was the way that, as cities grew, churches left the older neighbourhoods to follow the upper middle-class to new districts, where they erected the impressive structures of the sort so well depicted in *Esther*. But in becoming congregations of the prosperous business and professional elements in society, at the same time the churches were losing their hold upon the poorer labouring population, whom they left untended in the slums.

The result was the movement known as the Social Gospel, which argued that churches must be less concerned with individual salvation in the afterlife and more concerned with social problems on this earth, and especially show more interest in the condition of the working class. This led not only to many ministers expressing a greater sympathy for the reform movements of the day but also to the development of what became known as institutional churches, which provided social services in poor neighbourhoods, services similar to those of the new settlement houses. Another indication of this concern was the appearance of the Social Gospel novel, "a distinct and peculiar literary form developed over a quarter of a century by a series of lay and clerical authors", which, according to Henry May, was the "Social Gospel's most spectacular and eventually most successful medium".²

Of the three novels selected to represent this genre, the first chronologically was *Annie Kilburn*, by William Dean Howells, published in 1888. Of the writers we are considering, Howells was the most distinguished professional novelist. Born in Ohio, he had lived in Boston for a number of years when he was editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* but later moved to New York City to be on the staff of *Harper's Monthly*. He also wrote a large number of novels depicting American middle class life, of which the most famous is *The Rise of Silas Lapham*, which made him one of the pioneers of realism in the United States. Frederic, for example,

¹ The churches' attitude in the period 1861-76 has been described as "The Summit of Complacency". Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York, 1949), pp. 39-87.

² *Ibid.* p. 207.

was a great admirer of Howells and deliberately modelled his realism upon him.¹ But until the middle 1880s Howells had been a conservative who accepted the philosophy of *laissez-faire*, who voted for the Republican Party and whose realism was limited to what he himself described as the more smiling aspects of American life.

But then came a profound change in Howells's views. Like others of his conscientious middle-class contemporaries, he was shocked to learn of growing class conflict in the United States. One episode contributing to this awareness was a street-car strike in New York in 1886 which later was to play an important part in another of his novels, *A Hazard of New Fortunes*, but the event that most disturbed him was the trial and execution of the Chicago anarchists involved in the Haymarket Affair of 1886. Howells was one of the few who dared to challenge what seemed to him a shocking instance of judicial murder.

All this caused Howells to lose much of his earlier complacency and to become concerned about matters to which he had formerly been indifferent. He began to feel considerable guilt over his comfortable existence compared with the plight of others. This made him responsive to the ideas of social critics like Henry Demarest Lloyd, Henry George and Edward Bellamy. Especially he fell under the influence of Count Tolstoy's Christian Socialist philosophy and for a while even called himself a socialist.²

As a consequence, in the late 1880s and early 1890s Howells's novels turned from a consideration of individual problems to a concern with the problems of society. The first of these was *Annie Kilburn*. The story tells how Annie Kilburn, a wealthy orphaned young woman, returns to her native town of Hatboro' in the interior of Massachusetts after several years abroad. What had been a typical attractive little New England village,

¹ Carter, *Howells and the Age of Realism*, p. 240.

² For the background of Howells's social interests, see Walter Fuller Taylor, "On the Origins of Howells's Interest in Economic Reform", *American Literature*, ii (March, 1930), 3-14 and "William Dean Howells and the Economic Novel", *American Literature*, iv (May, 1932), 103-13; Carter, *Howells and the Age of Realism*, pp. 170-85; Edwin H. Cady, *The Road to Realism: The Early Years 1837-1885 of William Dean Howells* (Syracuse, N.Y., 1956), pp. 244-5; May, op. cit., p. 211.

originally called Dorchester Farms, has become a manufacturing town, first of hats (hence the new name of Hatboro'), then of shoes and finally of stockings, with an influx of Irish, French-Canadian and Italian immigrants constituting the labour force. At the same time South Hatboro' has developed into a fashionable summer resort. These changes have created much sharper class distinctions than had existed previously, a matter of constant concern to Howells.

Annie has returned vaguely anxious to do good, especially something that will improve the condition of the working people and bridge the social gulf that so distresses her. But what can she do? She considers becoming a nurse among the sick poor, but she has no training. She contemplates making nourishing little dishes for them, but this hardly seems enough. She sends an ailing child away to the seashore, but all that happens is that it dies there. Therefore she leaps at a proposal of the summer people to present some amateur theatricals to raise money for a Social Union, which will provide a reading room and restaurant for poor people. At this point Annie, who herself is a Unitarian, seeks the support of the Congregationalist minister, the Rev. Julius Peck, and is astounded by his opposition.

Peck is a former hand in a cotton mill who worked his way through school and has a strong feeling of identification with the working class. He opposes the amateur theatricals and the Social Union scheme on the ground that it is mere charity which still maintains social distinctions and displays no genuine feeling of brotherhood. In a sermon to his congregation Peck expounds his social philosophy at length. After describing the disturbing problems of the day, the growth of trusts, the destruction of small business and the rise of class warfare between the rich and poor, he argues that equality is more important than liberty. He insists that ¹

in the truly Christian state, there shall be no more asking and no more giving, no more gratitude and no more merit, no more charity, but only and evermore justice; all shall share alike, and want and luxury and killing toil and heartless indolence shall all cease altogether.

But opposition develops in the person of the well-to-do merchant, William Gerrish, who is one of the leading laymen in

¹ W. D. Howells, *Annie Kilburn* (New York, 1891), p. 240.

Peck's church. Whereas in the theological novels the conflict is between a minister and his beloved, one of whom believes and the other does not, in the Social Gospel novels the conflict is usually between a liberal minister and a conservative businessman who dominates the church. In this instance Peck's opponent, whom Howells describes very unattractively as a self-made man notorious for his harsh labour policy, is so incensed by Peck's sermon that he marches himself and his family out of the building in the middle of the service and starts a campaign to oust Peck from his post.

Although the congregation votes to retain the minister, he resigns nonetheless rather than become a source of conflict. He decides to go off to Fall River, then one of the most important centres of the textile industry in Massachusetts, to establish a co-operative boarding house and also to teach school to the children of the mill hands, as well as to open a night school for the workers themselves. He feels that so long as there is "hardship and overwork for underpay in the world, he must share them".¹ What would have come of his idealistic schemes is unknown, because en route he is killed in a railroad accident, one more victim of the modern technology whose evil effects he has been trying to overcome. The cases of Ward and Peck suggest a high incidence of clerical mortality in the late nineteenth century, but it is merely an easy way for novelists to extricate themselves from difficult situations.

Meanwhile, Annie has been gradually absorbing Peck's philosophy until she becomes "the fiercest apostle of labour that never did a stroke of work . . .".² She had once "expected to be a sort of Lady Bountiful here; and now I think a Lady Bountiful one of the most mischievous persons that could infest any community".³ Her conclusion is that charity is played out, and only justice can cope with poverty: "Those who do most of the work in the world ought to share in its comforts as a right, and not be put off with what we idlers have a mind to give them from our superfluity as a grace."⁴ For a while she wants to go off to Fall River to become a mill hand herself, but

¹ W. D. Howells, *Annie Kilburn* (New York, 1891), p. 299.

² *Ibid.* p. 329.

³ *Ibid.* p. 261.

⁴ *Ibid.*

she ends up merely sponsoring a Social Union of the very type she had decided was inadequate, ironically named after its critic, Peck. She even accepts a small salary for managing its accounts, though she feels it is ridiculous for her to take it.

It is typical of Howells's honesty or confusion, depending on one's viewpoint, that he has no real solution to offer Annie. He merely concludes : ¹

The Social Union itself, though not a brilliant success in all points, is still not a failure ; and the promise of its future is in the fact that it continues to have a present. The people of Hatboro' are rather proud of it, and strangers visit it as one of the possible solutions of one of the social problems. It is predicted that it cannot go on ; that it must either do better or do worse ; but it goes on the same.

Annie Kilburn never became a best-seller in the way that some of Howells's earlier works had been, though in the 1930s the social consciousness of the depression period revived some interest in it along with the other reform novels of Howells that had immediately followed it. Probably it has always been better known, however, than the next novel to be considered, the far less skilful *Murvale Eastman*, *Christian Socialist*. Its author, Albion W. Tourgée, has been called " perhaps the most neglected figure in American literature " ; ² if so, this is probably as much Tourgée's fault as the American public's. Born in Ohio in 1838, he served as an officer in the Union Army during the Civil War and then became a carpetbagger, that is, a Northerner who remained in the South after the war, living some fifteen years in North Carolina. Active in politics, he served as a judge there for some time and thereafter was always known as Judge Tourgée. In the mid-1870s he began writing a series of seven novels which together constituted a history of the North and the South from about 1840 to the close of the Reconstruction period in 1877. Of these the most successful was *A Fool's Errand*, one of the " better sellers " of 1879, which was compared with *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and caused Tourgée to be called " the Victor Hugo of America ". About the same time he returned to the North, settling in upstate New York, writing for various magazines and

¹ W. D. Howells, *Annie Kilburn* (New York, 1891), p. 327.

² George J. Becker, " Albion W. Tourgée : Pioneer in Social Criticism ", *American Literature*, xix (March, 1947), 59-72.

newspapers and delivering many public lectures. In the last few years before his death in 1905 he served as the American consul in Bordeaux.¹

Murvale Eastman, Christian Socialist appeared in 1890 and the scene is laid in a large northern city similar to Buffalo, New York, or Cleveland, Ohio. One of its leading religious organizations is the Church of the Golden Lilies, probably Presbyterian, which quite typically has just moved uptown into a newer and more fashionable residential area, leaving its working-class members behind. Tourgée's description of the church, named for its handsome stained glass windows, is reminiscent of Henry Adams's portrayal of St. John's in *Esther*. Once again there is also a young, good-looking new minister from a well-to-do family of good social standing, this time named Murvale Eastman.

When a street-car strike occurs in the city, similar to the one in New York that had attracted Howells's attention a little previously, Eastman receives a letter asking why he has never discussed the problems of capital and labour so as to teach the poor contentment with their lot. Eastman decides that first he must learn more about the problem and so, instead of going away to the seashore for his month's summer vacation as is generally assumed, he secretly goes to work as a driver of one of the horse cars. The first thing that shocks him is to discover that the company takes better care of its horses than its drivers. Convinced by his experience that the churches have neglected social problems, he announces that for a year he will devote his sermons to the subject of Christian Socialism and soon organizes in connection with his church a group known as the League of Christian Socialists.

At first glance it seems as though we have moved on to a far more radical position than was expressed in *Annie Kilburn*. Christian Socialism, of course, had originated in mid-century England with Frederick D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley and had recently been revived there by a High Church Anglo-Catholic element in the Church of England. In the United

¹ "Albion W. Tourgée", *Dictionary of American Biography*, xviii. 603-4; *Who's Who in America 1903-1905* (Chicago, 1903), p. 1494; Wagenknecht, *Cavalcade of the American Novel*, pp. 493-4; Mott, *Golden Multitudes*, p. 323.

States a radical Episcopalian clergyman, the Rev. William D. P. Bliss, organized a Society of Christian Socialists in 1889, the year before *Murvale Eastman* came out, which claimed that the teachings of Jesus led inevitably to Socialism. Although it was a short-lived organization that never amounted to much, the idea of Christian Socialism was very much in the air at the time Tourgée wrote.¹

It turns out, however, that Murvale Eastman does not have anything so extreme in mind at all when he organizes his League of Christian Socialists. Though he is aware that the early Christians practised communism, he declares that the experiment had proved a failure. Unlike Howells, Tourgée also seems to have little use for George's single tax, Bellamy's Nationalism or "the pessimistic foulness of Tolstoy".² According to his spokesman, Eastman, Socialism means only a desire to improve social conditions, and Christian Socialism means nothing more than the application of Christian principles to social problems.

Three major issues disturbed Tourgée. The first was the employers' lack of consideration for their workers as persons. Thus, as a street-car driver, Eastman strongly objected to being known merely as Number 46. When later he has a chance to outline to the company the reforms he favours, they consist of nothing more startling than using the names of workers rather than numbers, providing a better waiting room for them, emphasizing rewards for good conduct rather than penalties for bad and once a year giving the employees the whole of one day's proceeds, preferably at Christmas.

In the same way, the accomplishments of the League of Christian Socialists after its first few months seem something of an anti-climax. One company has been induced to rescind its rule against employees wearing beards, another has dropped its requirement that its workers buy their uniforms only from one firm which is more expensive than others, and there has been a drive against obscene literature.

¹ William D. P. Bliss, *The Encyclopaedia of Social Reform* (New York and London, 1897), pp. 251-8.

² Albion W. Tourgée, *Murvale Eastman, Christian Socialist* (Montreal, 1889), p. 214.

The second situation that distressed Tourgée was that small businesses were being forced out of existence with the result that many middle-class people were becoming proletarianized, though that is not the precise word he used. He felt very strongly that something must be done to revive self-employment and to create a diffusion of ownership among a large number of small merchants and manufacturers. Profit sharing seemed to be his chief hope.

The final problem was that modern urban life had destroyed neighbourliness and what Tourgée calls "mutuality of relation". Therefore one of the characters decides to devote his fortune to building a clubhouse for poor families, which in particular would contain playrooms and nurseries where mothers could leave their children, a project strongly reminiscent of Annie Kilburn's Social Union.

With so limited a programme in actual practice, it no longer seems strange that several well-to-do businessmen in the church prove quite willing to join the League of Christian Socialists. Even so, the group arouses antagonism in some circles. Once again a conflict develops between the reform-minded minister and the wealthy layman. Eastman's enemy is Wilton Kishu, the man who has actually given the land on which the church stands and who has been accustomed to have the church do exactly as he dictates. Tourgée's picture of the businessman has the merit of emphasizing that Kishu's chief passion is not for wealth but for power and prestige. His anger at Eastman is not so much that he fears Eastman's doctrines threaten his property as that they question his right to dominate the church.

He tries to secure Eastman's ouster from the Ministerial Association on the ground of doctrinal unsoundness concerning hell and eternal punishment, thus introducing an element of the theological novel. Like Gerrish in *Annie Kilburn* he fails, but Eastman, like Peck, resigns from the Association rather than become a subject of controversy and involve the churches in any endorsement of what is admittedly an uncertain experiment. Somewhat melodramatically, Kishu then determines to blow up the church rather than allow it to pass out of his control, but, at the last moment, a picture of Christ reminds him of the sacrilege he is about to commit. He suffers a stroke, and, when he recovers

he has been saved from sin and converted to Christian Socialism, Murvale Eastman variety.

Although Henry May calls the book "the best known" of several such social gospel novels at the end of the 1880s¹ and a current critic declares that it "deserves a place among the best of the works of the last two decades of the century on the economic and social problems of an expanding capitalism",² Tourgée displayed far less literary skill than did Adams, Mrs. Deland, Frederic or Howells. The novel is both diffuse and didactic, as well as having several romantic and confusing subplots involving a kidnapped child, a mysterious woman in black, a crippled opium addict, the restoration of a large fortune to a defrauded heir and a strange opal that dates from the early Christian era. Tourgée has remained best known for his novels of southern life, in which the current concern over racial problems has renewed some interest. The account of his life in the *Dictionary of American Biography* does not even mention his having written *Murvale Eastman* and, of the six novels we are considering, it is the only one not included in the *Oxford Companion to American Literature*.

Bad though it is, it is not as bad as our last novel, *In His Steps*. With it we hit rock bottom from a literary viewpoint. But, as Frank Luther Mott has observed, "As literature, it is nothing less than amateurish; as a social document, it has first-rate importance".³ Its author, Charles M. Sheldon, was born in New York State in 1857, attended Eastern schools and then in 1889 was called to Topeka, Kansas, to become the minister of the new Central Congregational Church. He is, therefore, the only actual minister among our six writers. Topeka gave him his first acquaintance with modern urban problems. After he had been there a few months, he put on some old clothes and spent a week going about the city seeking work, thus acquiring first-hand evidence on the plight of the unemployed. It is not clear

¹ May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*, p. 208.

² Becker, "Albion W. Tourgée", p. 29.

³ Mott, *Golden Multitudes*, p. 197. Cf. Wagenknecht's verdict that it has "no literary quality whatever", but "is the outstanding example among a vast number of religious books, most of which never get into literary histories" (*Cavalcade of the American Novel*, p. 491).

whether he had been inspired by reading *Murvale Eastman*, which appeared about the same time, or whether this is merely an example of life imitating art, if we can use that word for Judge Tourgée's efforts.

Inspired by his experiences, Sheldon next spent several weeks incognito among all the chief social groups in the city. As a result he concluded that the church should be more concerned with social questions and, again like Eastman, decided that he would henceforth devote his Sunday evening sermons to discussing them. With a flair for the dramatic, however, he did this in the form of stories, at the rate of a chapter a week, each of them continued over an entire year, which later a Congregationalist journal in Chicago, the *Advance*, first serialized and then printed in book form.¹

None of these ever achieved the sensational success of *In His Steps*, originally delivered in the winter of 1896. Its great appeal was due both to the times and to Sheldon's particularly effective method of presentation. His timing was excellent. The years from 1893 to 1897 were ones of acute economic depression producing widespread social unrest. In the year 1894 alone there had been a national railroad strike which the federal government suppressed by sending in troops, there had been the march to Washington, D.C., of a group of unemployed known as Coxey's Army demanding government aid, Henry Demarest Lloyd had published his influential attack upon monopolies entitled *Wealth Against Commonwealth*, the United States Supreme Court had aroused criticism by declaring a federal income tax to be unconstitutional, and a radical farmers' third party, the Populists, had polled a million and a half votes. Agitation was so rampant in Sheldon's own state that in the very year the young minister was telling his story a young journalist named William Allen White wrote a famous editorial, "What's the Matter With Kansas?"

Thus there could hardly have been a moment better suited for Sheldon's message, but the particular form in which he cast it greatly enhanced its effectiveness. The First Church of the city

¹ Charles M. Sheldon, *In His Steps*: "What Would Jesus Do?" (Chicago, 1898), p. 3; Mott, *Golden Multitudes*, pp. 193-4; May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*, p. 209; Charles Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism* (New Haven, Conn., 1940), p. 142.

of Raymond is a Middle Western counterpart of Adams's St. John's and Tourgée's Church of the Golden Lilies. It is attended by all the leading citizens, it is famous for its fine choir, the sermons are noted for their good taste and the minister, the Rev. Henry Maxwell, is addressing only the employer class and has no contact with the residents of the city's slum area, known as the Rectangle.

In the midst of one of Maxwell's Sunday sermons comes a dramatic interruption from a tramp, a former printer displaced by a new linotype machine, who has been unable to find work and has received no help from the presumably religious church people. He poses the problem of the church's identification with the upper class and its failure to reach the poor : ¹

It seems to me sometimes as if the people in the city churches had good clothes and nice houses to live in, and money to spend for luxuries, and could go away on summer vacations and all that, while the people outside of the churches, thousands of them, I mean, die in tenements and walk the streets for jobs, and never have a piano or a picture in the house, and grow up in misery and drunkenness and sin—

At this point he collapses and presently dies. Maxwell is so disturbed that in his next sermon he asks for volunteers to take a pledge not to take any action during the coming year without first asking, "What would Jesus do?" Several of the most prominent members of the congregation, including the superintendent of the railroad shops, a millionaire merchant, the president of the local college, a young club man, a newspaper editor, an heiress and a talented young singer agree to do so. Each week Sheldon's audience returned to find out what happened to each of them, as absorbed as they were later to be in "The Perils of Pauline", and even the modern reader is equally curious as to how it will all work out.²

¹ Sheldon, *In His Steps*, p. 15.

² Actually Sheldon was not quite as original as either his Topeka audience or subsequent readers may have supposed. In 1894 a British journalist, William T. Stead, after investigating social conditions in Chicago while visiting the World's Fair there, had published a widely read exposé entitled, *If Christ Came to Chicago*, which had suggested that in such a case Jesus would want all to follow in his footsteps and reform social conditions. Stead at least noticed how similar Sheldon's approach was and in a later English edition of his own book subtitled it, "The precursor of *In His Steps*" (Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, pp. 146-7).

The superintendent of the railroad shops develops Tourgée's interest in better facilities for the workers and decides that Jesus would set up a room for the employees to drink coffee and to hear fifteen minutes uplifting talks, thus benefiting them both physically and morally. But next the superintendent encounters a more fundamental issue. He discovers that the company is violating the Interstate Commerce Act, the federal law regulating railroads. He reports the violation, resigns his position and has to go back to his old job as a telegraph operator.

The other volunteers manage to avoid such severe penalties for their new attitude. The merchant studies the career of Titus Salt, the English industrialist from the Bradford area, and announces that henceforth "He would engage in business for the purpose of glorifying God, and not for the primary purpose of making money" and that he will try to develop more loving relations with his employees on the basis of considering them chiefly "in the light of souls to be saved".¹ In order to know them better he starts holding meetings with them, with the result that several of them burst into tears, presumably of appreciation. His reward is that, when he becomes ill later, his workers are extremely sad and offer to give him whatever help they can.

The college president decides that it is time for professional men to enter politics to end corruption and eliminate the menace of the saloon. Rallying the leading men in the church into political activity for the first time in their lives, he almost wins the next election. The young wastrel turns to reforming another neglected social group, his fellow club men, and gets them to change many of their habits, especially gambling. The newspaper editor eliminates all accounts of prize fights, crimes and scandals, bans advertisements for liquor and tobacco, decides future editorials will judge all issues on their moral rather than partisan aspects and finally concludes that Jesus would not issue a Sunday edition. The results are nearly disastrous financially, but the young heiress, who has been feeling guilty about her wealth, much like Annie Kilburn, gives the editor a five hundred thousand dollar endowment to continue to run the paper along Christian

¹ Sheldon, *In His Steps*, p. 90.

lines. Then, after studying the current movements for institutional churches and settlement houses, and especially the work of Arnold Toynbee in the East End of London, she decides to use the rest of her fortune to establish a lodging house for shop girls in the slum area.

The talented singer refuses an excellent job because she does not think Jesus would sing in a travelling comic opera and instead devotes herself to singing at revival meetings which some local evangelists are conducting in the Rectangle and ends by giving music lessons to the slum residents. As for the minister himself, he realizes that he must make greater efforts to reach the working classes whom he has so long ignored. But increasingly he becomes preoccupied with the fight against the liquor traffic, in his view the greatest social evil of the day, a reflection of the sentiment which for so many years made Kansas the symbol of the prohibition cause.

Meanwhile, the movement also spreads to Chicago, where unemployment and slum conditions are even more disturbing. The minister of a fashionable church and an Episcopalian bishop, both also filled with guilt at their comfortable, even luxurious, lives, resign their posts in order to turn a former brewery warehouse into a settlement house, while a once frivolous society girl joins them to teach girls going into service "plain cooking, neatness, quickness, and a love of good work".¹

Actually, however, Sheldon proves no more radical than Howells or Tourgée. He expresses their same middle-class attitude in his rejection of extreme solutions like the single tax or Socialism and his insistence that following Jesus does not mean anyone has to do anything so drastic as giving away all his wealth. All that is needed is not a change of system but a change of heart within the individual to follow Christian principles.

If *In His Steps* has the least literary merit of all the novels we have considered, it nevertheless has enjoyed the greatest popularity. Published by the *Advance* in 1897 after the usual serialization, it had sold 100,000 copies by June of that year before it was discovered that the copyright was defective.

¹ Sheldon, *In His Steps*, p. 245.

Thereupon sixteen publishers quickly siezed upon it and presently thirty British firms also issued it ; at one time a penny edition was sold on the streets of London. Not only have new editions continued to appear right up to the present day, but it has been translated into French, German, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Russian, Turkish, Welsh, Hungarian, Japanese, Persian, Armenian, Hindu and Esperanto and has also been both dramatized and filmed. As a result it is widely reputed to have become one of the greatest best-sellers of all time, second only to the Bible, though Frank Luther Mott has shown that popular estimates of its having sold thirty million copies are almost certainly greatly exaggerated. Nevertheless, it may well have had a sale of two million in the United States and of six million more in other parts of the world.¹

In conclusion, of the theological novels *Esther* best reflects the conflict of science and religion, with Adams taking a highly cynical viewpoint as to the ultimate validity of either. Mrs. Deland showed how an insistence upon strict Calvinist dogma could produce in reaction a complete loss of faith. Frederic suggested how demoralizing the impact of the Higher Criticism could be upon a minister of inherently weak character.

As for the Social Gospel novels, they all demonstrate both the strength and the limitations of the middle class conscience. Nothing could document better the extent of strong guilt feelings over the growth of poverty, economic inequality, class distinctions and the churches' neglect of the working class. None of them, however, is actually written from the viewpoint of the labourers themselves ; the problems are always viewed through the eyes of the middle class. Hence there is a rejection not only of revolutionary violence but also of any drastic changes in the social system. Instead, it is hoped that drawing people's attention to their Christian obligations will be sufficient to improve conditions. Particularly striking is the almost complete lack of interest in either Negro rights or international relations, the two issues which would loom largest to the modern American liberal.

¹ Hopkins, *Rise of the Social Gospel*, p. 142 ; Mott, *Golden Multitudes*, pp. 195-7 ; Knight, *The Critical Period in American Literature*, p. 123.

These novels are admittedly neither valuable as pieces of literature nor profound in their solutions of extremely difficult problems, but nevertheless they are revealing guides to what was disturbing sensitive, conscientious middle-class Americans in the closing years of the nineteenth century.

THE EXETER DOMESDAY AND ITS CONSTRUCTION

By R. WELLDON FINN, M.A.

1. *The Background*

THE *Liber Exoniensis*, colloquially but somewhat unfortunately known as the "Exon" or "Exeter" Domesday (for this is but a part of the collection of documents), should have attracted more attention from the earliest commentators on Domesday Book than it did. For not only is it the sole surviving source of any portion of the Exchequer version, but it is also almost certainly an initial conversion of primary hundredal, manorial and burghal returns to the Inquest of 1086 into a feudal form.

Much of the original material is now lost; what remains occupies 532 folios, written on both sides, of which almost one hundred pages are entirely blank. The matter was inscribed in loose booklets, 103 of which have survived. In the late fourteenth century these were bound up in illogical order, but were rearranged, largely according to the plan of the Exchequer Domesday, by Sir Henry Ellis before the text was first printed in 1816. The booklets vary considerably in composition: some are indeed not true booklets, but consist of a single leaf (e.g. fols. 107, 107b; 193 (blank), 193b); there are two dozen of four leaves each, fifteen of six, twenty-three of eight, and one of twenty-six. In 1811 they had been given reference letters and numbers (*a-5f*).¹ The scheme was a somewhat imperfect one, for it would have been better to allot an appropriate reference to a booklet known to be lost; e.g. that which must have followed fol. 414 and contained the portion of the lands of "Rualdus Adobatus" which in the Exchequer Domesday (115a2) closes his fief. The material which has survived consists of:

¹ T. W. Whale, in "History of the Exon Domesday", *Trans. Devon Assn.*, xxxvii. 246-83.

folios

- 1-3b. MS. A of the geld accounts for Wiltshire.
- 7-9b. MS. B of the geld accounts for Wiltshire.
- 11-12b. Dorset boroughs.
- 13-16b. MS. C of the geld accounts for Wiltshire.
- 17-24. Geld accounts for Dorset.
- 25-62b. Dorset Domesday (twelve fiefs only, with a single Wiltshire entry on fol. 47).
- 63-4b. Two lists of Devonshire, Cornish, and Somerset Hundreds (these do not coincide with the Hundreds of the geld accounts).
- 65-71. Geld accounts for Devonshire.
- 72-3. Geld accounts for Cornwall.
- 75-82b. Part of the geld accounts for Somerset.
- 83-494b. Exeter Domesday proper (in all relevant fiefs, Devonshire lands precede those in Cornwall, and these those in Somerset).
- 495-506b. *Terrae Occupatae* for Devonshire.
- 507-8b. *Terrae Occupatae* for Cornwall.
- 508b-25. *Terrae Occupatae* for Somerset.
- 526-27. A small part of a Somerset geld account (this is probably a copy independent of that above, for Thurlbear appears in both).
- 527b-31. Summaries of the lands of a few fiefs (all shires are represented: that for the Somerset lands of Glastonbury Abbey appears also at the end of the feudal account, fol. 173).
- 532-532b. List of twenty-six fiefs and headings (this alone styles the geld accounts *Inquisitio Gheldi*).

Though, as will later be demonstrated, something other than hundredal, manorial and burghal returns seem also to have been used in its making, these must have been the principal source of fols. 11-12b, 25-62b, and 83-494b, and probably of *Terrae Occupatae* also. For though there are inconsistencies and interruptions, in each fief the Hundreds appear in a sequence the regularity of which is most marked, and all holdings in a fief within a single Hundred normally come together. For example, in all Devonshire fiefs, entries for the adjacent Hundreds of Lifton, South Tawton, Black Torrington, Hartland, Shebbear, Fremington, and North Tawton precede those from others, and for all but three entries the above order of Hundreds is in any fief invariable. From fol. 125 to fol. 129b (thirty-two consecutive entries) every entry is for Braunton-with-Shirwell Hundred. Twenty-seven manors of Roger de Courseulles in Cannington Hundred (423-6) are consecutive. Robert of Mortain's manors in Tybesta Hundred occupy the whole of

booklet 3e (247-254b), and two entries for it, probably post-scriptal, immediately precede these forty-eight entries (245b; 246, 246b are blank). Examples could be multiplied indefinitely.

But here regularity ceases. The manner in which the Exeter Domesday section of the work can have been constructed has long been a mystery. For the handwritings of a number of clerks appear and disappear at irregular and apparently illogical intervals; moreover, the work of more than one writer can in a number of instances be seen within the compass of a single entry.¹

A glance at any consecutive dozen lines of the manuscript is apt to be disconcerting. It is frequently immediately obvious that a quite considerable number of different handwritings is represented, and that some of the scripts are by no means easy to distinguish from each other. Whale's suggestion that there were two groups of clerks at work, one native and one Norman, employing for *et* the Insular *ꝛ* and an ampersand respectively, is obviously inadequate.² Very rarely, and usually for short stretches of the work only, does any clerk maintain consistency of formula, contraction, or orthography. (Here the handwritings will be distinguished by allotting to each a somewhat appropriate capital letter.) Clerk A, for example, spells *Gytha Guitda* and *Guida* in consecutive entries (106b, 107); F, who mostly contracts *animalia* to *animl.*, includes an occasional *aialia.*, and having, in thirteen consecutive entries, reduced *mansionem* to *ma.*, writes *mans.* in his next two (323b-6, 331b).³ In his first fifteen Somerset entries, J writes *ecclesia* seven times, and *aeclesia* thrice. C has *in qua est* for sixteen out of his seventeen entries beginning with fol. 225b, but once he writes *in ea est*, which at 228b becomes his normal introduction.

It is impossible altogether to attribute these inconsistencies to the possibility that a clerk may have been copying exactly whatever he had before him, and that he was reproducing the orthography, formulae, and contractions of more than one

¹ E.g. *Ratdona* (316). One clerk recorded the name of the owner and of the manor, and its assessment, while a different clerk wrote the remaining seven lines.

² T. W. Whale, "Analysis of Exon Domesday", *Trans. Dev. Assn.*, xxviii. 391.

³ It is unfortunately impossible, without the use of Record type, to indicate the forms of the contractions.

predecessor. Nor can it be assumed that they are the product of dictation. If either was a governing factor, it is most improbable that one clerk, and one clerk only, would intermittently have written ÷ to represent *est*, or twenty times in rather more than sixty entries would have used the spelling *hyda*, and in the same space written also *hida* eleven times. The fairly consistent use by another of an *x* instead of the usual *c* in certain proper names, too, must be due to individual idiosyncrasy.¹ Orthography and formulae are unquestionably apparatus full of latent dangers. But each is at times so markedly characteristic, and the employment of a word-form or formula so unlike that of some clerks whose handwritings can more readily be isolated from the rest, that, coupled with a suggestive but dubious script, they may well help to determine its author.

The varying physical conditions under which the work was executed, and mental or bodily fatigue on the part of a clerk, or even the quality of the writing materials, might cause a handwriting to vary so appreciably that often we may think we are seeing the work of two clerks where only one is in fact represented.

It seems as if about a dozen clerks worked on the Exeter Domesday. Only two—clerks G and A—contributed to the accounts of all four counties (the solitary Wiltshire entry surviving may be ignored); J is found in all except Devonshire. F appears in Devonshire and Dorset; S in the former and in Cornwall. T is to be found in Devonshire only; H and D confine themselves to Somerset material; the work of C is not found outside Cornwall. Owing to the paucity of the Dorset material, it is difficult to apportion certain scripts, but I think that two, and perhaps three, writers, B, E, and K, are represented here alone.

Almost every entry is prefaced by a sign presumably included to indicate where the record of a major holding began. The signs are of varying design, and several of the clerks employ distinctive types of these. That of G, for example, is a long pennon, with one or more lines running its length, on an extensive

¹ E.g. Bristrix (394b), Halebrix (331b), Brixtrix (421b), Alebrix, Albrix Alrix, Alurix (333-4, 368b, 396).

staff ; A's pennon is squat and plain. F employs what looks like a forward-sloping capital Y with closed top ; S a sign resembling a straggling capital T. Unfortunately, these signs are often a clue to the writer of only doubtful value. Consistency of design is lacking, and often a clerk, on completing the account of a manor, inscribes his own characteristic sign, but a different clerk then writes the entry following it. Some of these signs, notably those of D and H, are extremely complex.¹

2. *The Handwritings*

The characteristic prefatory sign, and the capitalization of the G of *Gildum*, are but two of the outstanding features of clerk G's work. He uses the Insular or Runic ʝ for *et* = and, frequently omits the amount of *terra villanorum*, and, on the whole, contracts very little, but spells words such as *carruca*, *villani*, *quadragenaria*, in full. He is inconsistent, for he uses, e.g., both *tagni* and *tegni*, and *ferlinus* and *fertinus*, and sometimes employs both forms within a single entry. His work as a whole displays marked carelessness and orthographic instability ; many of his more obvious mistakes are underscored in the text to show that correction was required (though frequently no correction was made). He writes, for example, *in lalat.* (underscored) for *in lat(itudine)*, *pues* for *oves*, and *uillainos*, *angilicus*, *ferttinus*, *redididit*, *tenuitunt*, *uallebat*. He contributes in the neighbourhood of 550 entries.

A script, neater than G's, which is fairly easily identifiable on sight, is that of clerk A, who uses the ampersand for *et* throughout. He is perhaps the most consistent of all the clerks as regards abbreviations and orthography ; in most instances he spells out *animalia*, *villani*, *arare*, and *agros* in full. His Somerset entries, however, for the most part make use of *aialia.*, and of the *fertinus* spelling, whereas in his Devonshire and Cornish work *ferlinus* predominates at first, changing to *fertinus* in booklet 3c, and back to *ferlinus* in 3e. Minor idiosyncracies are the use of a character larger than usual for a Roman figure *v* or for that letter ; a high consistency of employment of *tegnus*, *teglanda* ;

¹ This, too, is a feature of Vol. II of Domesday Book (the record of the eastern counties).

and beginning the final phrase of his entries *hec* (not *et*) *valet*.¹ A seems to have written over 700 entries.

Clerk F was the author of rather less than 100 Devonshire entries, all of which come from the fourth to the sixth groups of Hundreds in order of appearance in any fief, i.e. for manors in the east and south. He also seems to have written ten of the 161 surviving Dorset entries, all in western Hundreds. The script is somewhat italic and angular; the ampersand is largely used for *et*, but there is a tendency to employ, in the final lines of an entry, the Runic γ , and to use this over letters to indicate a contraction. He normally contracts *mansio(nem)* to *mans.*, and uses *animl.* and the *ferlinus* spelling. Minor characteristics are frequently writing *viii* rather than *ix*, and *nemeris* for *nemoris*. F's work is to be seen on, e.g. fols. 49-51, 310b-11, 324-6.

The prefatory sign of clerk T is inconsistent, and there is no appreciable degree of uniformity reflected in the 200+ entries he contributes to the Devonshire section. He often uses *mans.* for *mansio(nem)*, *G.* for *gildum*, *aialia.*, *aial.*, and *aal.* for *animalia*. He largely uses the *ferdinus* form, but is inconsistent about the employment of *viii* or *ix*, *runcin(os)* or *rucin(os)*. For *et* he uses the ampersand. Both F and T very frequently contract *servos* to *serv.* T's handwriting can be seen on fols. 295-6b, 301b-8, 411b-13, etc.

Clerk S also writes over 200 entries, mostly for Devonshire (though little for the south), and about a score of Cornish entries from fol. 259 onwards. His contractions are somewhat irregular, for he uses indifferently *gild.* and *gildu.*, *animl.* and *anil.*, but shows a preference for *ferdinus* over *ferlinus*. He has two strongly individual characteristics; the writing of *iiii*^{or} or *viii*^{to}, where other clerks have a plain *iiii* or *viii*, and the not infrequent use of ÷ for *et* in addition to a normal employment of the ampersand. It is only in his work, and within a comparatively small geographical area, largely in west Devonshire, but including a little of east Cornwall, that the unusual spelling *hyda* instead of *hida* appears. He contributed largely to the Devonshire section of

¹ The work of A and G can be seen in the first (A) and two subsequent entries (G) in the reproduction of a page of the Exeter Domesday in the printed *Additamenta* volume (iv) of Domesday Book.

Terrae Occupatae. Good examples of his work are to be found on fols. 290-4b, 313-14b.

Clerk C is to be found only in Cornish material, to which he contributes about sixty entries. He writes a neat, upright, regular hand, ruling his guide-lines rather closer together than does A, from whom he took over when the first ten manors in the Hundred of Winnianton in Robert of Mortain's fief had been inscribed. His prefatory sign is not unlike A's, but the open pennon is more elongated and slopes upwards; he uses a long-tailed Insular ʒ for *et*. He is not alone in using *villani* (*habent*) *alteram terram* instead of specifying the hidage of the *terra villanorum*, or in changing from consistency of employment of *ferdinus* to that of *ferlinus* in the midst of his work. All but sixteen of his entries do not begin a new line. His work is on fols. 225b-33b and 244-5b.¹

Clerk J writes a somewhat italic hand, often prefaced by a sloping sign of three lines converging downwards to a single tail with a bar across the top of the three lines. He uses both ampersand and Insular ʒ, but has a number of distinguishing features, among which are making a diphthong of what elsewhere is merely *a* or *e*, and, when *s* follows a vowel, ligaturing the two letters, with the *s* small and superscript. He writes *Craeneburna* (61b), *aequas* (for *equas*, 57), *Leomaerus* (56b); the last folio is a good specimen of his style of writing. He writes *tannus* for thegn, and, like A, often ends *hec* rather than *et valet*. He contributes at least thirty-four Dorset entries, in which he several times writes *sollidi* for *solidi*, and *gueldum* for *geldum*. The latter appears not infrequently in the *Terrae Occupatae* section for Somerset also, as does *geldum*; here J wrote practically all the entries after the fortieth one. In all he wrote at least 150, and perhaps nearly 200 entries. Characteristic work of J's can be seen on fols. 59-62b, 145-7b, 185-7.

¹ C displays several points of interest. His Mortain fief entries for Winnianton Hundred are the only ones in the section which do not have a marginal *f* against them, and these are the entries which were omitted, when the Exchequer text was made, to avoid duplication of material. Does the *f* indicate that an entry so prefaced was copied, or was meant to be copied? Also, he spells the name of the former Abbot of Tavistock—Sihtric—correctly, whereas other clerks have Suetric or Sistric. Was he by any chance a local man?

Clerk H writes not far short of 200 Somerset entries. He has a number of characteristics: the frequent reduction of *molendinum* to *mol.*, the writing of *leuga* as *leugua*, the contraction of *bordarios* to *b.*, and, in mentioning *terra villanorum* or tenants' teams, introducing the phrase by the words *villani habent, qui habent, villani sui*, and adding *suo* to the standard phrase *in dominio*. He displays a preference for the forms *tannus, tanlande, fertinus*. *St-* at the beginning of a place- or proper name is ligatured. His work is visible on fols. 141b-5, 352-5b.

Clerk D was responsible for between fifty and sixty Somerset entries. He has a tendency to be uncertain about aspirates: e.g. he writes *abt.* or *abuit* for *habuit*, and *Hedricus, Harundel, Hengelerus*, while frequently the *h* which should have come at the beginning of a word is interlined.¹ Almost invariably he writes *leuga* as *leuca*, and *tantundem* as *tantondem*, though frequently *u* has been written above the *o*. A score of times he, like J, ligatures and superscribes *s* after a vowel in penultimate place; he consistently uses *ferdinus* or *firdinus*, *tannus*, and *moledin.* or *molendin.*, and uses *viii* more often than he does *ix*. D, too, is guilty of many major errors: he writes *seous* and *soruos* for *servos*, *nissi* for *nisi*, *reccaepit* for *recepit*, *cadrucas* for *carrucas*. Fols. 140-1, 373-3b, 444b, 453-3b display his work.

It is possible that on fols. 430-1b and 463-3b the work of yet another clerk, confined to Somerset entries, appears, but it is not very likely that one would deal with only some twenty manors.

The material of Dorset is too slight for pronouncements to be really definite, but it is probable that work which is not that of G, A, J or F appears. Half-a-dozen times the *guel*-spelling occurs, but the work does not seem to be J's; the clerk who writes these passages may have made about twenty entries, several of which have *log.* for *long.*, *tagnus* or *tannus*, *hec valet*. Some other entries are marked by extreme contraction of words: *mas.* or *ms.* or *ma.* for *mansio(nem)*, *car.* for *carr.* or *carruca*. But we really have insufficient specimens to allow for profitable deduction.

Despite the imperfections he manifests, it may be that G

¹ See, for example, fols. 140-1, 351, 363b, 374b, 438b, 478b.

occupied a position of special responsibility. He wrote about 40 per cent. of the material for *Terra Regis* for Somerset, and 30 per cent. of that for Devonshire. He wrote all of it for Cornwall; indeed, until the conclusion of the Church fiefs is reached (208b), he wrote all but six of the entries for the first fourteen Cornish sections, embodying nearly 100 entries. He was responsible for a high proportion of the lists of Hundreds on fols. 63-4b, the geld accounts for Dorset, Devonshire and Cornwall, and probably all but five of those for Somerset. He may also have contributed to *Terrae Occupatae* for Devonshire. A's work too suggests comparative eminence, both from the volume of his output, the fact that he wrote all but six of those entries for the Somerset *Terra Regis* which G did not, early contributions to the Cornish Domesday, and probably some entries in the lists of Hundreds and the Somerset geld accounts. It is of interest that the hand which wrote the account of the Bath Abbey demesne manors in the Bath Cartulary, which so strongly resembles the Exeter Domesday account of these, looks very like that of A, while the formulae, contractions, and orthography are also similar to his.¹

Finally, there are three entries which are in the script, not of any of the above clerks, but of an Exchequer scribe, which suggests that the *curia* may have sent officials to Exeter to organize and superintend the work.² None of the hands described above in any way resembles the set hand of the *curia*.

3. *The Making of the Record*

It is virtually certain that the Exeter Domesday is an initial conversion of returns grouped by manors, boroughs and Hundreds into a form in which the unit is the fief. The arrangement leaves us in no doubt that Wiltshire and Dorset material was to some extent kept separate from that of the other three shires, for on no occasion is material from the first group found in

¹ For a discussion of the resemblances (but not of the script), see R. Lennard, "A Neglected Domesday Satellite", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lviii. 32-41.

² These are reproduced, and discussed, in R. Welldon Finn, "The Evolution of Successive Versions of Domesday Book", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxvi. 561.

a booklet which contains what is relevant to the second.¹ The postscripts, interlineations, and *marginalia* are so numerous, and the arrangement sufficiently imperfect, as to negative the possibility that we have here a copy of an earlier draft.

But the composition of the booklets suggests very strongly that the organizers had considerable knowledge of how much space a section would occupy; yet a collation of the Exeter Domesday with the *Terrae Occupatae* section shows that not all the material available was included in the former.² Obviously the work was to some extent planned; there is no suggestion of continuous redrafting irrespective of ultimate convenience in handling the products. When dealing with the Dorset lands of Roger Arundel, the clerks began a new booklet (*k*). His fief occupied three pages, 50-1b, and eight lines of fol. 52. They left the rest of 52, and all 52b, blank, which experience had probably suggested was a wise precaution, since in the accounts of many other fiefs postscripts had had to be added marginally or where inadequate space for them existed. This left them one leaf of the booklet for the addition of another small fief, and on fol. 53 the two manors of Serlo de Burcy were inscribed, leaving 53b blank. We do not know what other small fiefs were still not dealt with, but it so happens that only one fief which follows these in the Exchequer text was small enough to be included on what was left of fol. 53 and on 53b.³ The bulk of the Devonshire fief of Baldwin of Exeter was inscribed in three booklets (3*k*, 3*l*, 3*m*; fols. 288-311b), each of eight leaves. This left twenty-four Devonshire and three Somerset entries

¹ Except for the Summaries, from fol. 527b to 531. William de Mohun's lands both in Wiltshire and in Dorset appear on fol. 47.

² E.g. information about a virgate of land called *Ledforda*, which happens also to occur in the geld account for Williton Hundred (509b, 79b), that Torchill was a Dane (*Celuia*, 518b; *Caluica*, 450), the existence of the manor of *Chefecoma* (499, 117). Frequently *Terrae Occupatae* gives information about individual manors absorbed by 1086 into a different manor which in the Exeter Domesday has been converted into a single comprehensive statement. *Terrae Occupatae*, incidentally, looks as if it might be a fair copy, and not original work.

³ Probably they would not put that of Humfrey the Chamberlain (83ai) here, because it would make him precede his more important brother Aiulf, the sheriff of Dorset, and Aiulf's fief would have taken up at least three leaves.

for inscription, which would and did go comfortably into a four-leaf booklet (3*n*; 312-15b).¹

Calculation, however, was often imperfect. A ten-leaf booklet is by no means unknown, and one of this size would have absorbed William of Mohun's manors in Devonshire and Somerset. When 3*w*, of eight leaves (356-63b) was complete, six entries were as yet unmade; these were added in a 2-leaf booklet (3*x*; 364-5b), and though fols. 365, 365b needed to contain three lines only, no fief other than William's was begun in the vacant space. Robert of Albemarle had sixteen manors, all in Devonshire. They would not have gone into the space afforded by a two-leaf booklet, and one of four leaves would have been over-generous, since probably there was no other small Devonshire fief uninscribed, while the logical juxtaposition would be that of Roger of Courseulles in Somerset, which is a very large one. The result is a three-leaf booklet (41; 419-21b) completely filled. Two-, four-, and eight-leaf booklets, the most convenient to handle, were designed whenever possible.

It is not only collation with *Terrae Occupatae* which suggests that the Exeter Domesday does not contain all that it might have done. The geld accounts record men and estates of which we can find no trace in Domesday Book, but from this we must not argue too closely, for the dates and material of their sources and those of Domesday Book might not be identical. Still, the apparent absence of manors from the Exeter version argues a certain carelessness.² After finding the space for the name of a manor left blank (436), we are not surprised also to find entries giving no place-name, but merely *tenet i mansionem*, or a holding described merely as *Terra Colgrini* (423b), or an entry (not included in the printed text) which says only *Eduuardus tenet iii hidas terrae* (398). Despite the checks on the work obviously

¹ Yet there are suggestions that a clerk may not have been conscious that he had finished a section. At the end of Baldwin's fief comes the customary prefatory sign, as though the writer expected there was still more to come. But he may have inserted it unthinkingly.

² Collation of the text with the geld account for Bath Hundred shows that a manor of Shaftesbury Abbey, probably Kelston, was missed from the Exeter Domesday. Royal manors in Swanborough and Highworth Hundreds seem to have been omitted. (See *V.C.H. Wiltshire*, ii. 185, 211.)

applied, the text is very far from being a perfect one, and we may with reason think that one cause of this was that it had to be compiled as rapidly as possible.

The clerks have concealed a number of their errors from us. *Terrae Regis Dominicae* for Cornwall end on fol. 102b, and as far as we know from the geld accounts, etc., no royal manor is omitted from this. But, beginning at line 15, there are traces of an erased entry, which begins, as is customary, *Rex habet i mansionem quae vocatur* (place-name illegible) *quam tenuit Heraldus*. Possibly an account of the anonymous hide which Earl Harold had wrongfully taken from St. Petrock, about which King William had ordered a trial (*iudicium*) to be held, and the Church in justice to be reseized of it (204b) was begun here, but its inclusion thought in the end to be unnecessary. On fol. 138 (the last leaf of a six-leaf booklet), is an erasure which, from what is still legible, suggests that the clerks began to write a Summary of the Bishop of Coutances's Somerset estates comparable to those of fols. 527b onwards (it is noteworthy that a virtual copy of the Summary of the Somerset lands of Glastonbury Abbey was included at the end of the account of the fief, fol. 173).¹

It is unfortunate that the compilers did not see fit to include the name of the Hundred in which each manor lies. However, by use of the geld accounts, the sequence of entries, and later documents, this can usually be determined with reasonable certainty. Reference has already been made to the fact that in almost every fief entries for a Hundred are found together without interruption, and that the Hundreds follow each other in regular sequence (p. 361). This is most strongly apparent in Devonshire, where the Hundreds fall into six largely geographical groups.² It is suggestive that frequently the Hundreds of a

¹ On fol. 270, marginally at line 16, is a suggestion (not given in the printed text) that a clerk had got so far in reckoning the difference in values for Robert of Mortain's manors (which was given on fol. 531 in the Summary of his lands): the entry looks like *hic computantur appreciari peiorari*. . . .

² A consistent order of Hundreds in each fief, and geographical groups of Hundreds, are features of the Norfolk Domesday. Much which deals with hundredal sequences in Domesday Book is to be found in P. H. Sawyer, "The 'Original Returns' and 'Domesday Book'", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxx. 177-97, and in R. Welldon Finn, "The Making of the Devonshire Domesdays", *Trans. Dev.*

group are consecutive both in the geld accounts and the lists of Hundreds. The fifth group, for example—Axminster, Colyton, Axmouth—come together in geld accounts and lists of Hundreds, and in the former in the same order as in the Exeter Domesday. This is not true of Cornwall, where a regular sequence of Hundreds is not so apparent, though in all relevant fiefs Winnianton Hundred comes first, and four times out of six Tybesta appears second. In Somerset the order in which the Hundreds occur in any fief is apt to be irregular, but in almost all of the fiefs the Hundreds in the west of the shire and south of the Mendips come first, then those north of the Mendips, finally, running from north to south, those in the east. A marked system of groups, and regularity of order, is noticeable in Dorset.

But in a limited number of instances the structure is disturbed as a result of errors or by the manner in which the Inquest seems to have been conducted. On fol. 388b, two manors in Fremington Hundred were inscribed. Then, on fols. 389-90, a different clerk wrote the account of nine in North Tawton. Presumably it was then discovered that *Johanesto*, the last of Goscelm's manors in Fremington, had been overlooked; it was at once inscribed, and the clerk followed it with the three remaining manors in North Tawton. It is indeed possible that some of the misplacements are not the result of clerical error, but caused by doubt as to whether some passage was to be included, or in what form, the entry being held back until this was settled.

If the occurrence of the varying scripts is set against the sequence of manors in a fief, it is at once apparent that in the majority of instances the handwriting changes when a shift occurs from one Hundred to another. In numerous cases, however, one clerk will inscribe the manors in two or three consecutive Hundreds, but still the change of script occurs when the last of these Hundreds is completed.

Obviously only full tabulation can display the workings of the system, but the record of one small fief will demonstrate it. The Somerset lands of Alfred d'Epaignes are on fols. 371b-5.

Assn., lxxxix. 93-123 and "The Making of the Somerset Domesdays", *Proc. Som. Arch. and Nat. Hist. Soc.*, xcix-c. 211 ff. The Devonshire Association has kindly allowed me to reproduce here certain passages from the above article.

The first three manors are in North Petherton Hundred, and are all inscribed by clerk G. The next six are all in Cannington, and A's work. Then five in Williton were written by clerk D, one in Carhampton by A, and one in Milverton by H. The final eight manors are in five different Hundreds, and written by five different clerks. But, as we shall see, errors were apt to occur. Apparently a manor in Abdick Hundred was inscribed before it was discovered that a second manor in Milverton had been overlooked.¹ The fief ends with three manors in Andersfield (A), *Achelai* (Hundred uncertain—D's work), one in Taunton (A), and one in Frome (G).

The Bishop of Coutances's Devonshire manors which lie in the initial group of Hundreds mentioned above occupy four double-sided folios (121-5b). Clerk A writes the Lifton entries, G the early ones from Black Torrington; then S writes the remainder for this Hundred, those for Hartland, and the early ones from Shebbear. Clerk T finishes off Shebbear; in turn A and G inscribe Fremington entries, and also those from North Tawton. The system seems to persist even in those entries in the Cornish fief of Robert of Mortain which are postscriptal to the bulk of its entries. On fol. 259, after G has inscribed eighteen manors in Rillaton and seven in Connerton, S appears when a block of seven manors in Stratton, followed by a number from other Hundreds, begin. On 262b A writes two Winnianton entries; J follows with six in Stratton and six in Rillaton.

Coupled with the fact that sometimes an entry is the work of more than one clerk, the frequent absence of apparent system governing the changes of clerk is at first sight disconcerting. It is plain, too, that there are accounts of fiefs which are not

¹ But there may be reason for this misplacement: the manor, Preston in Milverton, was held by Hugh of Alfred. Now a Hugh de Vautort holds a part of Preston from Robert of Mortain, and this has been taken out of the distant royal manor and Hundred of King's Brompton (103); moreover, one of the two entries about Preston in *Terrae Occupatae* (515) says that Robert fitzIvo holds some of Preston of Robert, but the Exeter Domesday does not mention this. It may be that tenurial ramifications were such that clerk H did not know if Preston should be included here, and that while enquiry was being made, clerk A carried on and inscribed the account of *Ila*. Or the commissioners may not at the critical point have decided about the legality of ownership of these Preston holdings.

arranged on the normal hundredal basis. An outstanding example is that of Glastonbury Abbey in Somerset. On the normal geographical basis, *Dereberga* in Cannington should have come first, but this is placed sixth, with a manor in Winterstoke opening the account. The manors in Frome Hundred (*Mulla*, *Wateleia*, *Camelertona*, *Crenemulla*) are separated into two pairs by four manors in four different Hundreds. Glastonbury, and its associated islands, close the main account, and there follow notes on manors in which various laymen had acquired, apparently illegally, Glastonbury property. The Abbey had recently suffered vicissitudes of varying kinds, and it may be that the clerks, four of whom, with A and J predominating, contribute to the account, took their material from a schedule supplied by the Glastonbury authorities. The possibility of individual returns by fees is not small.¹ Other fiefs with unusual structures are those of the Bishop of Winchester and Athelney Abbey in Somerset, and of St. Petrock (which had suffered severely from losses of land to laymen) in Cornwall. The manors in St. Petrock's own Hundred are interrupted by those in the three other Hundreds in which the Saint held land.

One other possibility of apparent disturbance of hundredal order existed. We cannot be sure that the units of the Inquest were invariably the Hundreds as indicated in the geld accounts. It is true that Hundreds of Wellow and Kilmersdon, places within Frome Hundred, are named in the lists of Somerset Hundreds on fols. 63b-4b, but the geld account knows Frome Hundred, comprising Frome and Wellow and Kilmersdon, only. But while the geld accounts show that some of the Bishop of Wells's manors were therein considered as part of the Hundreds in which they were physically situated (e.g. Banwell in Winterstoke, fols. 77, 157), the bulk were treated as composing "part of the land which belongs to the honour of the bishop" (78b), an artificial and widely dispersed unit of which we hear nothing in the lists of Hundreds. In these Wells and Wiveliscombe and Kingsbury Hundreds appear, but in the geld accounts these episcopal manors are all included in Bishop Giso's Hundred.

¹ See V. H. Galbraith, "The Making of Domesday Book", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lvii. 175-7, and C. Johnson in *V.C.H. Norfolk*, ii. 2.

The geld accounts have only a Hundred of Yeovil (*Givela*, 79). But the structure of Domesday Book shows that for Inquest purposes those of Tintinhull, Houndsbarrow, Stone, and *Liet* or *Lieget*, which comprised it, were treated independently. Each of these appears in the Hundred lists (as does that of Coker which formed part of Yeovil geld-Hundred, but for which *Liet* is substituted); the appearance of these Hundreds in most fiefs (e.g. that of Robert of Mortain) is not consecutive, but the Yeovil constituents are interrupted by entries from Hundreds other than these four.¹

It was the irregularity of hundredal sequence throughout Domesday Book rather than the traces of systematic order which first attracted the attention of early commentators. Ballard thought that the material had been dictated to the inscribing clerks, and that for each shire there were at least two pairs of clerks involved; it was his contention that as work on one Hundred was completed for the individual fief by one pair, its record was exchanged for that which the other pair had been using.² Now dictation, the presumption of which was pressed into service to account for the frequently-varying spellings of Hundred- and place-names, might seem to be an incomparably inconvenient method of executing the work, and inevitably productive of far more errors, corrections, erasures, and disorders than we find displayed therein. The irregular sequence of the various clerks' work, moreover, hardly suggests that dictation was the method employed. On this principle, too, the occurrences of Hundreds should alternate, and though the order of appearance in, e.g. Devonshire and Norfolk, is at times inconsistent, the instances of irregularity form a very small minority. Differences of pronunciation by dictating clerks could well account for the extraordinary variations of place- and

¹ Domesday Book quite often mentions Hundreds which are not among those which normally furnish the rubricated divisions, e.g. *Cresseuella* (207a2) and *Kenebaltune* (206b2); in the Isle of Wight were *Cauborne hundred quod iacet in Bovecome Hundred* (52bi) and *Hemreswel* (54ai) which seems to have contained three small manors only.

² A. Ballard, *The Domesday Inquest* (p. 17). W. de G. Birch (*Domesday Book*, p. 52), and O. J. Reichel *V.C.H. Devonshire*, p. 379) seem also to have thought that the matter was dictated.

proper names which are everywhere apparent. But equally they could have originated during the making of an earlier record of the Inquest, or in a list of properties within a Hundred, such as an earlier account of geld liability or payment, which the clerks might have used to guide them.¹ It is most improbable that, if dictation had been employed to produce the Exeter Domesday, we should so frequently find displayed individual clerical idiosyncracies, e.g. S's use of *hyda* within a limited geographical area, D's *leuca* and H's *leugua*, J's *gueldum*. But it is altogether probable that, when the 'original returns' were being prepared, clerks unfamiliar with English or local name-forms might write them down phonetically and that individual pronunciations would produce strange variants.²

A possible means of procedure would have been for a clerk to take the Inquest's record of the first Hundred to be inscribed and work steadily through it, fief by fief. Indeed, this would seem to furnish a potentially economic system, for once he had completed the entries for the first fief, another clerk could have begun on the Hundred to be dealt with second, and others could have followed him. But this does not appear to have been the system employed. The entries for Shebbear Hundred, for example, in the order in which the fiefs now appear, are the work in turn of G, S, T, A, T, G, A, S, and so on. It is quite common for the consecutive entries for a Hundred in a fief to be the work of more than one clerk; e.g. G writes the first entry for Bishopsworth in Bedminster (141b); the second immediately

¹ *Boteberia*, *Boltesberia*, appear consecutively on fols. 219b, 220; *Crahecome* and *Crauecome* on fols. 310, 310b, yet the same clerk writes each pair of entries. We have *Lonmela* and *Lonmina* in the space of five entries from 393-4, both clerk F's work, and G writes *Wesfort* and *Wesforda* in consecutive entries on 409b. A clerk is capable of inscribing two versions of a name in a single entry; e.g. *Brantona*, *Bractona*, on fol. 83b and again on fol. 498b. There is no uniformity in Exeter Domesday entries and the corresponding passages in *Terrae Occupatae*; we find *Afetona* and *Afretona* (342b, 503b), *Sidelham* and *Sidreham* (318, 495b), *Engestecota* and *Hainghestecota* (122b, 497).

² Not infrequently a holding is said to be *ad* rather than *in* somewhere. This has produced, e.g. *Atiltona* for Ilton (191), *Æford* for Ford (273b), *Telbricg* for Ellbridge (245b), *Dorseda* for Orsett (II, 26b). Dr. P. H. Reaney has suggested to me that a single sound would probably not convey the same combination or order of letters to different clerks.

follows it, but is H's work.¹ It might be expected, too, that under this system the clerks would have begun a fresh booklet for each tenant-in-chief; or else that those who hold lands only in, e.g. south-west Devonshire, would come in the same booklet. But Ruald 'Adobatus' and Robert of Albemarle do not; between them comes William of Poillei. It does occasionally happen that all the entries for a Hundred, usually a small one (e.g. Cutcombe-with-Minehead) are the work of a single clerk. It happens also that the whole of a fief, again not a large one, e.g. that of Bath Abbey, was inscribed by one clerk only. But this might be entirely fortuitous. Throughout, we are handicapped by not knowing in what order the fiefs were inscribed, but it is reasonable to suppose that those of laymen were considered largely in order of size and importance, and probable that inscription was in accordance with the principles of sequence displayed by the Exchequer Domesday.² In this *Terra Regis* comes first; there follow, as a rule, the lands of the Bishops, and then the lands of the abbeys and the earls, while at the very end come the lands of the king's sergeants and thegns.

An alternative system would be the completion of a fief in a single operation. This would have been economical of time, for as soon as a clerk had written the entries for one Hundred, he could pass to another fief, still working on the same Hundred, while a different clerk could work on the first fief for the next Hundred to be considered. But this does not seem to have been the system adopted. For example, the Somerset fief of Robert of Mortain begins with an entry in South Petherton by G, but H writes the next three entries, also in this Hundred, as are the next two, which G inscribed. Immediately following is an entry for Williton Hundred and another for Bullstone, both G's work, and then come six manors

¹ There is only one Hundred of Bedminster in the geld accounts. But one Hundred list records two: *Betmenistre* and *Bedmynstre* (64b). Moreover, the manors are *Bischeurda* and *Biscopuorda*; they were perhaps independent settlements. Thus G and H may have been dealing with separate Hundreds.

² It is interesting that while in the Exeter text demesne manors, or those of a single sub-tenant, are rarely grouped together as they often are in the Exchequer version, the royal manors have been rearranged in groups according to previous owner.

in Tintinhull written by A. A further argument against the employment of this method is that very frequently the entries on the individual folio do not look as if they were all inscribed at the same time, especially when manors appearing consecutively are in different Hundreds though written by a single clerk.¹

What might account for all the above irregularities and eccentricities would be the compilation of the Exeter Domesday as the Inquest proceeded. They might even manifest themselves if the entries were made, not as soon as the material was furnished by delegates and jurors, but, say, at the close of each day's proceedings. I very much doubt, however, if the manuscript would look as clean as it does if this had been the method employed, especially if enquiries had been conducted at Hundred-moots and it had travelled with the clerks from place to place. There are a number of further arguments against this hypothesis also. It is improbable that the completeness, largely regular sequence of information, and comparative neatness of most entries would be as adequate as we find these to be. Many a large manor consisted of a *caput* and a number of associated villages, often well distant from the *caput*. It is possible that some at least of these returned figures giving the statistics for the manor as a whole. But, since frequently we find separate entries for the demesne and the sub-tenancies, and also interlineations furnishing what look like the figures for outlying holdings, it seems more likely that the information about a complex manor originated in a number of returns, and that where these were thrown into a single entry, this was not done during the actual holding of the Inquest.²

¹ E.g. on fol. 266 *Crauecom*a in Williton was surely not inscribed by G as soon as he had written *Lopena* in South Petherton immediately above it. Nor does it look as if A wrote *Estochelanda* in Cannington as soon as he had completed *Tetesberga* in North Petherton (356), or *Gernefella* in Bruton straight after *Vdeberga* in Frome (447). Or see *Stocca* (452), *Brien* (354).

² We have separate figures for most of each of the named villages which make up the dispersed Glastonbury manors of fols. 161b-9b, or the royal manor of Keynsham (113b-4). For interlined statistics, see, e.g. *Banuelia* (157, 157b). We cannot help feeling suspicious about the discrepancies between Exeter and Exchequer figures for Sidbury (118b, 102ai), for the latter gives 5 hides against 3 in the former, 30 ploughlands against 20, 25 against 18 tenants' teams. T.R.E. there had been two holders, Alwine and Godwine, and it looks as if the surviving Exeter text gives us the figures for one holding only, and that those of the

The details of *Terrae Occupatae*, too, show that there was at the disposal of the clerks information about each of the numerous pre-Conquest manors and holdings which by the time of the Inquest had been absorbed in some other manor. To *Aissa* (269, 513b) had been added the holdings of two thegns, rated at one and a half hides, and worth £3 6s. 8d.; collation of the entries shows that *Aissa* itself without the additions was rated at two and a half hides and was worth £1 13s. 4d. The Exeter Domesday gives merely the total value of £5.¹ It is questionable, too, whether, if inscription synchronized with Inquest, the organizers could have calculated as adequately as they did what space would be required for a fief with manors in more than one shire.

Yet it does seem that the Exeter Domesday must have been inscribed, at least in part, while the Inquest was in progress. It is surely significant that almost all the *marginalia* and postscripts, and a number of the interlineations, are concerned with illegal additions to and ablations from manors, inability of holders to separate themselves from the lordship or manor to which they were attached, failure to pay customary dues, and similar irregularities. Among all these we find, for example, the wrongful inclusion of *Nimeta* in the manor of Molland (95), the detachment of *Pendauid* from the royal manor of *Glustona* (101b), the claim of the Bishop of Coutances to have *Boeurda* because it had been Brictric's—but "the thegns do not know by what means Brictric had it" (126b), the inability of the thegns who were the predecessors of the *milites* of Tavistock Abbey to "separate from the Church" (177), the statement that the holdings of Robert of Mortain which "could not separate from" the royal manor of Winnianton (99) were "of the demesne manor called Winnianton" (225b-6). They include the detachment of moor and meadow and coppice from Seavington and their transference from the Mortain fief to the royal manor of South Petherton (265b), and the retention over periods

other were added to the copy from which the Exchequer text was made. The *Inquisitio Eliensis* often gives the assessments and values of manorial components where Domesday Book does not.

¹ Here, as it happens, the Exeter Domesday gives us the hidage of the additions; usually only *Terrae Occupatae* does so, and sometimes it gives the number of ploughlands for these also.

varying from twelve to eighteen years of the customary dues payable by certain local manors to Axminster (84b). More significant still, *each* of certain entries made in duplicate is marginal or postscriptal. The former holder of a hide in the manor of Ditchet "could not separate from the Church"; the entry is marginal both on fol. 170 and in *Terrae Occupatae* on fol. 519; marginally we are told that Keinton Mandeville lay in Barton St. David in King Edward's day (434b), and the hide at which it is rated is recorded postscriptally on fol. 480. It is equally suggestive that the addition of the manor of Barlington to that of Roborough is marginal on fol. 124b, and postscriptal on fol. 102a2 of the Exchequer Domesday text. It may be that the Exchequer clerks did not notice the entry until they had completed the column, but this suggests that it was marginal also in the copy of the Exeter Domesday they were using, and therefore perhaps that it had not been added to the original when the making of the copy was begun. Examination of the manuscript suggests, from the difference of colour in the inks employed, that most of the *marginalia*, and many interlineations, are postscriptal. Good examples of these are apparent on fols. 315b, 350, 491, and in the case of an obvious postscript to fol. 443b (*Aisxa*). Much of the geld accounts, too, do not suggest that they were inscribed in a single operation, for the colour of the ink frequently changes (e.g. on 70b at line 16), and the detail for Black Torrington was altered during its reproduction.¹ All this suggests, first, that when the clerks began the construction of the Exeter Domesday, there were outstanding a number of disputed points or illegalities about which the inquisitors had formed no judgement, or about which they wished to hear further testimony; they are all the kind of difficulty about which we hear, in the record of other shires, that the witness of the Hundred or the shire had been demanded. Secondly, it suggests that the making of the copy which the Exchequer clerks used was begun while the work of inscribing the Exeter Domesday was still in progress. This suspicion is intensified when it is found that a number of the discrepancies between the Exeter and the Exchequer versions are apparently caused by the

¹ See H. P. R. Finberg, *Devonshire Studies*, p. 34.

late addition to the Exeter text of figures which presumably were not transferred to a copy already made for Exchequer use.¹ It is significant, too, that in the Essex Domesday, which is surely a fair copy of a document comparable to the Exeter Domesday, the majority of the postscripts are of a character similar to those indicated above.²

The possibility of simultaneous execution of original and copy, then, could explain the apparently unsystematic appearance of individual handwritings, especially when we can see that the first draft was fairly adequately checked. Apart from the frequent interlineation of figures, words, and phrases, there are numerous deletions, erasures, and underscorings.³ It might be, then, that a clerk wrote the entries from one or more Hundreds for a fief, and then passed his work over to another for checking (and, it seems, sometimes received it again for correction, though on occasion a hand not that of the main text makes the addition or alteration). Meanwhile a third clerk carried on where the first left off, and it might be that another trio was similarly at work on a different section of the manuscript. Also, doubt as to what should next be inscribed, or whether something was to be included at all (or because the point was still under consideration) might cause a clerk to break off and apply to a supervisor for instructions, his interrupted work being taken up by a different clerk.

¹ Many of these are in an ink the colour of which is altogether unlike that of the surrounding text; see R. Welldon Finn, "The Immediate Sources of the Exchequer Domesday", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 40, p. 58.

Consideration of the Exchequer Domesday as a whole suggests very strongly that much of it was written while the Inquest was still being held. If so, the apparent presence of Exchequer clerks when the Exeter Domesday was being compiled (p. 368) is readily explicable.

² They include mention of *invasiones* (e.g. *Pheringas*, 14b, lines 15-7; *Neuelanda* (31, line 21), and the claims of Ely Abbey to lost lands (*Rodinges*, 49, line 20; *Phenbruge*, 97b, line 12).

³ E.g. an error has been deleted on fol. 342 (*Otria*); *nihil* struck through and *ualet iiii sol.* interlined (*Tarenta*, 32); there is a large erasure on fol. 267, and most of the account of *Achelai* (374b) is written over an erasure; the repetition of *de comite* is underlined for deletion on fol. 101, and so is *lalat.* for *lat.* on 102b. The words *consummatum est* occur ten times, in every case but one at the end of a booklet. They might denote the completion of copying or checking. In the margin of fol. 317, too, is the word *probatio*.

The Cornish Domesday alone is sufficiently compact for us to estimate a way in which it *could* have been compiled. The assumption has to be made that Devonshire was completed before Cornwall was begun, which from the structure of the manuscript and inherent probability seems a reasonable one to make. We can be sure that booklet 3*d* was written immediately after 3*c*, for the account of *Witemot* (241*b*, 242) carries over from one to the other. 3*f* was surely written last, for it contains the afterthoughts, and the last two entries on 245*b* are probably postscriptal, a blank space (246, 246*b*, which closes booklet 3*d*, are also blank) being used for two manors in Tybesta Hundred, the rest of the entries for which had filled 3*e* (247-54*b*).

G wrote all but half-a-dozen of the Cornish entries in *w*, *y*, 2*n*, 2*x*, and 2*y*. He took over from C where a return to manors in Rillaton Hundred occurs (as though it was discovered that C had missed these and had put in the manor in Stratton), while he did not inscribe the only two manors the Bishop of Exeter had in Winnianton Hundred. Were, then, other clerks working on the rest of the booklets concerned? A wrote the first ten entries in 3*b*, which he could have done whenever G was not using the material for Winnianton Hundred. C completes the booklet; J or S could have done the checking. The change from A to C comes, significantly, at a break in method mentioned above on page 366. A could have begun 3*c* as soon as C had finished inscribing Fawton entries and had turned to Stratton ones. He writes, indeed, all the rest of the Fawton material and then too turns to Stratton, and is not interrupted until he is well into 3*d*—after sixty-six consecutive entries there might well be a change, or the end of a day's work might have occurred. C continues with the Stratton and half-a-dozen Rillaton manors, which, except for the Tybesta postscripts, complete the booklet. The switches from one Hundred to another may seem entirely unnecessary. But an attempt at a feudal grouping can also be discerned, and may account for these.

C's Fawton entries begin with demesne manors, and pass to six held by Richard (the manors in Stratton he inscribes are largely Hamelin's). Later, beginning on fol. 259, seven manors held by Richard come together, then a pair of his in Rillaton and

his two in Connerton ; next comes Roger's two in Stratton and his pair in Rillaton.¹ A, then, or while C was at work, wrote the whole of 3e (all Tybesta entries). At the same time G, having finished the entries in the first five booklets concerned, could have been inscribing the Connerton manors which open 3f, and continued with a long string in Rillaton (once C finished his contribution to 3d). The remainder of 3f (from the last entry on 258b to 264b) looks like the insertion of manors previously overlooked or whose inclusion was deliberately delayed. The Hundred changes about a dozen times in this space, and all the clerks except C contribute. The only two manors not in the previous fiefs were both in Stratton ; G wrote that on 334b, A that on 397b. In all, G wrote about 661 lines, A 825, C 318, S 101, and J 61. If at least two clerks were inscribing simultaneously, the compilation of the Cornish section need have been only a matter of days.

If something like the above was the method employed, in shires where the number of Hundreds was large and the points of detail to be considered numerous, it is plain that which clerk would succeed his predecessor at the opening of entries for a fresh Hundred would be entirely fortuitous. Probably there is far more method and organization behind the construction of the Exeter Domesday than the mere text would suggest.

4. *The Duplication of Entries*

When the text of the Exeter Domesday is restored, largely with the assistance of the geld accounts, to its original hundredal structure, the number of duplicate entries becomes forcibly apparent. The common explanation of their existence has been that where dispute as to rightful possession occurred, the clerks were careful to note the holdings under each fief concerned.² Recorded in the Bishop of Coutances's Somerset fief is the manor of *Millescota* (147b), held of him for five and a half hides by "Asscelinus", and before him by two thegns "who could not

¹ An attempt to combine an hundredal with a feudal basis is occasionally apparent also in *Terrae Occupatae*.

² R. W. Eyton, *Notes on Domesday*.

separate from the church of Glastonbury". In the account of Glastonbury's manor of *Mulla* (Mells, 168), within which the modern equivalent of *Millescota* lay, "Ascelin" is said to hold five and a half hides of the Bishop, *de rege*, and the two thegns and their inability to leave Glastonbury lordship are also mentioned. These produced two corresponding entries in *Terrae Occupatae* (519b, 520), which suggests that Glastonbury had argued that the king could not legitimately transfer this subtenancy. Unless the Glastonbury return mentioned *Millescota* by name, it looks as if the passages emanated from two different returns, not one for the Hundred of Frome. Which of the claimants would be liable for the geld due from *Millescota*?¹ Roger of Courseulles's ablation of part of Long Sutton from Athelney Abbey is mentioned twice in each of the accounts of the fiefs concerned, and three times in *Terrae Occupatae*.² This does not suggest that the clerks drew their material from a single source only, or that they meticulously noted in purely hundredal returns which items had already been dealt with. Moreover, *Mulla* is clerk A's work, the other Glastonbury entries mentioned above J's, while *Millescota* is J's and *Hascecomba*, *Hotuna*, and *Illebera*, A's. H wrote one and A the other of the *Sutuna*, *Suttona*, entries in the Athelney account; A that in Roger's.

The Devonshire manor of *Touretona* was inadvertently twice recorded in the Exeter Domesday (98, 110b). G wrote the first, and S the second: each has *Gida* for Gytha, and the accounts correspond perfectly except for slight variations in phraseology and order, and G's *xix* where S has *xviii*.³ But we find in this

¹ At the end of the account of Glastonbury land (172-3) are notes of holdings which "could not separate" from the Abbey, but which are in the hands of the same Bishop and various lay tenants; almost all are said to be held *de rege*. They are recorded also in the fiefs of the newcomers. Each appears in *Terrae Occupatae* (524-4b), which suggests that the inquisitors were not satisfied that they had rightfully passed out of Glastonbury ownership. The variation in name-forms, too, may suggest that these had been the subject of more than one independent return: in the Glastonbury entries we find *Hetsecoma*, *Hutona*, *Elleberia* in both the account of the fief and in *Terrae Occupatae*; in those for the Bishop of Coutances, *Hascecomba*, *Hotuna* (*Hoctona*), *Illebera* (137, 139b, 510b, 516).

² Fols. 191, 191b, 435b; 515, 524b, 525b.

³ At some point lines were drawn round the second entry to show that it was unnecessary.

shire also the possibility of dual sources. In the account of his fief, Baldwin of Exeter is said to have eleven burgesses who dwell in Exeter and lie in his manor of *Chent* (297). They apparently appear again in the final entry for his fief (315), though here we read of "12 houses which belong to his manor of *Chent*". It looks as if A produced both versions: one may have come from an hundredal, the other from the burghal return. It seems, too, as if Newton St. Cyres was twice described (117, 483). The first entry, where *clamat* has been altered to *habet*, tells us how Bishop Osbern displayed his charters to support his claim to this manor, which "Domnus" is said to hold. In accordance with the witness of the *francigenarii* it has been adjudged to be the Bishop's; presumably this was the work of the Domesday Inquest, for it does not appear under *Terrae Occupatae*.¹ But in the second entry "Domnus" is said to hold *Neuuentona*, and, while the Bishop's claim is not mentioned, "Domnus" is said to have held it from King Edward and says he now holds it of King William. Did a single return produce both passages? And is the interlineation of *habet* late work, and the manor credited to both the Bishop and "Domnus" because at the time of initial inscription the question had not been settled? If so, it looks if the Exeter text was begun before the commissioners had finished their work.

The most illuminating series of duplicate entries is for the twenty-two manors taken by Robert of Mortain from the royal manor of Winnianton (99-100b, 224b-7). G was responsible for the first series of entries, A and C in turn for the second. The order in which the manors occur differs, and so do place- and proper names. We find *Cariahoil* (99b), *Cariorgel* (224b); *Brixius* (99b) and *Birihtsius* (226), and a number of other variants. Moreover, the discrepancies in the two sets of accounts are considerable ones. *Roscarnon* is in one said to be held by Grifin (100), by Grifin of Join in the other (224). Five manorial values differ, often appreciably; e.g. we have 5s. and 10s. for the same place, and *xxx den.* against *ii sol.*² The fiscal details

¹ Nor does Werrington (98, 178b), of which the *barones regis* had disseized the Abbot of Tavistock as a result of the testimony of Englishmen.

² *Trenant, Garuerot, Trenbras, Sanctus Maiuian, Roscarnon.*

vary still more greatly. Except in the case of the initial entry, we are told in the entries under *Terra Regis* that each manor gelded for so many geld-hides, -virgates, and -acres, but on turning to those in the Mortain fief find that these quantities are really those of total assessment, and that the number of hides for which each holding actually gelds—a different and smaller quantity—is given also. Surely all this implies independent returns; the one for the whole complex royal manor of Winnianton, an artificial agglomeration of small settlements scattered over at least fourteen parishes, and one for each of the constituents abstracted by the king's half-brother, which seem by 1086 to have acquired the status of independent manors, though it is said that "they could not separate" from Winnianton, and in the Mortain fief entries many are said to have been "of the demesne manor of Winnianton".¹

Wherever duplicate entries occur in the Cornish material, collation almost always displays discrepancies, which argue that a single source did not produce them. From the royal manor of *Lannohoo* (101) Robert of Mortain has taken away two manors, *Podestot* and *Sainguinas*, which have twelve ploughlands and were worth £3 when received. There are entries for each of these in Robert's fief, but there they are *Pondestoca* and *Sanguinas*, taken from *Lantloho*, have sixteen ploughlands, and had been worth £2.² The statistics, and certain other details, differ appreciably in the two accounts of *Treiwal*, *Treuithal* (208b, 258b), and of *Nietestou* (207b, 230b). But there can be no doubt that the entries each refer to a single holding, or part of it.

The task of the Exeter Domesday clerks, as of the inquisitors, was obviously an immensely complex one, which on the whole they executed admirably. Both analysis and synthesis of their work strongly suggest that their material was complex also. The possibility of their use of returns for certain major fees, in addition to the primary returns grouped by boroughs and

¹ In *Terrae Occupatae* (508) also their inability to separate is mentioned, and Robert is said to have taken them away (*ablatae*) from Winnianton.

² Fols. 238, 238b. These appear twice in *Terrae Occupatae* (507, 507b), and the name-forms vary in each entry and more or less correspond in turn with each of the variants of the Exeter Domesday.

Hundreds, is obviously considerable ; and so is that of their use of pre-Conquest lists of property and geld liability, possibly of recent geld collections as well.¹ These, indeed, are reflected in the Exchequer Domesday also, but much of what we may learn of the background to the Domesday Inquest is displayed only by the earliest conversion of the Inquest's primary material, the Exeter Domesday.

¹ The insistence on the status and tenure of manors in the time of King Edward is most marked, for usually who held it in 1066 determined who ought to be holding it in 1086. As Professor V. H. Galbraith has pointed out ("The Date of the Geld Rolls in Exon Domesday", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxx. 9-11), the Exeter Domesday contains a number of phrases which suggest that the inquisitors were interested in the efficient collection of geld, and that some of the phrases found in the geld accounts—surely not fortuitously preserved with the Exeter Domesday—appear in the Exeter Domesday also.

A MISSING LEAF FROM SWIFT'S "HOLYHEAD JOURNAL"

By GEORGE P. MAYHEW, M.A., Ph.D.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH
AT THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

I

PROFESSOR HERBERT DAVIS has recently remarked that Jonathan Swift's poems, dated from Holyhead in late September 1727, and the "Holyhead Journal", kept from 22-9 September 1727, are, apart from his *Correspondence*, "almost the only writings of Swift which we possess . . . during the year 1727".¹ As I shall argue below, a hitherto neglected manuscript in the hand of Swift now preserved in the British Museum seems to me to be a missing leaf from the "Holyhead Journal". By way of preface, however, I should like to analyse, mainly by reference to his *Correspondence*, the effect of this final visit to England in 1727 as it has bearing upon his "Holyhead Journal".²

Swift's final visit to England lasted almost exactly six months. He set out from Dublin on either Saturday, 8 April, or more likely on Sunday, 9 April, armed with a license permitting him to travel to England as well as to the north of France, to Aix (iii. 385). From Chester he travelled to Goodrich in Herefordshire where he visited the tomb of his grandfather, and from there he came to Oxford on 18 April and spent the night with his friend Stratford. On 22 April he arrived at Pope's house at Twickenham, coming by way of Tetsworth (iii. 386, n. 2, 426, n. 4). From Twickenham in May and June he made various

¹ Herbert Davis, ed., *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, 14 vols. (Oxford, 1939), in progress. See xii, pp. ix-x (Irish Tracts, 1728-33). Hereafter cited as Davis, *Prose Works*.

² F. Elrington Ball, ed., *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, 6 vols. (1910-14). Cited by volume and page number alone within the text of the first section; thereafter as *Corresp.*

excursions to London, to call upon the Earl of Oxford, to Bolingbroke's house at Dawley, and to Market Hill and Richmond Lodge, the residence of Mrs. Howard, and of the Prince and Princess of Wales (iii. 387-92). For three weeks in July Swift and Pope went on a long "ramble" through Cambridgeshire with the Earl of Oxford.¹

About three days after his return to London and then to Twickenham on 5 or 6 August, Swift was once more afflicted by a violent attack of his recurrent giddiness and deafness, an attack which plagued him until he began his journey back to Ireland (iii. 409, 425). Because of the painful and incapacitating nature of his disease, and the unsociability it forced upon him, Swift, now also afflicted by the distressing news of Stella's dangerous illness, left Twickenham reluctantly on 31 August and withdrew to London, to the house in New Bond Street of his cousin Patty Rolt, now Mrs. Lancelot (iii. 416). He may have gone, for a few days, to Hammersmith for his health with Mrs. Lancelot as nurse, as F. Elrington Ball suggests (iii. 421, n. 2). During his last few days in London Swift stayed at an inn in Aldersgate Street from which, on 18 September, he took coach for Chester to begin his homeward journey, and at which place his deafness seems finally to have left him (iii. 422, n. 1). At Chester he was offered but refused a swift passage across St. George's Channel in the government yacht commanded by Captain Lawson (iii. 425, n. 3).

As we learn from the "Holyhead Journal" Swift left Chester on 22 September, a Friday, and arrived on the 24th, a Sunday, at Holyhead where he was detained for "eight days" by adverse winds and equinoctial storms. After one false start he finally sailed from Holyhead on 1 or 2 October, only to be forced by another storm to land eventually at some distance from Dublin. He probably arrived at the Deanery in Dublin about 6 or 7 October 1727, on one of which dates his license expired (iii. 410, 426, 431).

The chief public event during the first five months of Swift's visit to England in 1727 was the unexpected death at Osnabrugge

¹ George Sherburn, ed., *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, 5 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1956). See ii. 441, 442. Hereafter cited as Sherburn, *Correspondence of Pope*.

on 11 June of George I, the news of which came to London on 14 June at the same moment that Swift arrived from Twickenham to prepare for his visit to France (iii. 399). His own illness, commencing about 5 August, and the distressing news of Stella's desperate condition which came in letters dated from Dublin on 19 and 24 August were private circumstances which spoiled the last two months of his stay (iii. 415, 419). All in all, Swift's final visit to England, one to which he had looked forward with all the anticipation of a man who is well aware that it was to be—as he so often remarked at this time—"the last journey I shall ever take thither", proved to be a series of frustrating experiences, of which the delays and inconveniences at Holyhead were only the last and most vexing of a long series (iii. 378, 389, 403).

It is, again, through Swift's *Correspondence* that we may trace his moods as well as his movements most clearly during this period. His letters of late 1726 and early 1727 often suggest the pleasure and high hopes with which he anticipated his final voyage. They sometimes also convey the sense of anticipatory melancholy with which he faced his inevitable return to "banishment" in Ireland. For example, writing to Pope and Gay and Bolingbroke soon after his return from the 1726 voyage to England, during which the arrangements for the publication of *Gulliver's Travels* were made, Swift explained why it was so difficult for him to write. The image he uses is striking :

Breed a man a dozen years in a coal-pit, and he shall pass his time well enough among his fellows ; but send him to light for a few months, then down with him again, and try what a correspondent he will be (iii. 348).

On 26 November 1726, a little over a month later, he writes again to Pope to say that "Going to England is a very good thing, if it were not attended with an ugly circumstance of returning to Ireland" (iii. 368). Given the compatible life and the congenial friends he left behind in London, the difficulties he had before him to face in Dublin, Swift's returns to Ireland in 1726 and in 1727 were progressively more difficult. In 1727, especially, he had quite consciously and stoically to summon up his long-cultivated self-control and sense of philosophical detachment in order to face the depressing circumstances of his return that year.

However, before setting out in April 1727, Swift seems to have looked forward to his last journey with high hopes and considerable enthusiasm. Stella's health had then reached a state of deceptively encouraging improvement (iii. 388, 416). It was to improve his own health, as well as to enjoy at first hand the effect of the recently published and translated *Gulliver's Travels*, that Swift planned to travel in France as well as to England (iii. 385, 392, 395, 398). Through Pope he was encouraged to believe that he might obtain a third interview with Sir Robert Walpole, in order to plead once more, as he had done in 1726, the case of Irish grievances (iii. 336-7). Although Swift could not take seriously Lord Peterborow's hint that an English bishopric might be awaiting him, he could, with the recently increased pension of Edward Young, the author of *Night Thoughts*, before him, half hope for a generous pension for the author of *Gulliver's Travels*, a hint of which he dropped to Mrs. Howard (iii. 150, 366, 371). And finally, besides the always welcome prospect of visiting such friends as Pope and Bolingbroke, Gay and Oxford, was the opportunity to discuss with them the manuscript of *The History of the Four Last Years of the Queen*, a literary and historical effort upon which Swift spent much time and by which he set great store. Optimistically, he appears to have carried with him to England the manuscript of that work in the hopes that he could make final revisions from the papers in the possession of the Earl of Oxford (iii. 221, 223).

Almost from the moment of his arrival in England his high hopes were dashed, one after another. Partisan politics were grown so warm by the time of his arrival at Twickenham that an interview with Walpole was out of the question, and Swift complained to Sheridan, in a letter of 13 May, that he was neglected by some who cultivated his friendship in the previous year. In the same paragraph he remarked that he was advised by his friends against going to France for fear of Whig vengeance to be exercised upon him while abroad (iii. 388). The death of George I momentarily deferred his visit to France, again upon the urging of his friends (iii. 397, 399). His own illness, and the news of Stella's fatal illness once more encouraged him to project his French trip now "to forget myself", and Swift seems to have

kept the possibility open, depending upon his own health and Stella's condition, almost until the moment he left London. At least as late as 12 September he wrote to a Dublin friend to renew his license to travel in *partes transmarinas* (iii. 419).

Soon after his arrival in England a high-handed exercise of his "Provost's Negative" by Richard Baldwin, the Whig Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, appears to have frustrated, and finally, to have caused Swift to cancel in anger a generous College fellowship bearing his name which he had established in what was possibly his first will.¹ The circumstances, which were quickly reported to Swift by his Irish friends at T.C.D., also served to show him the direction that the new political wind was blowing, now that George I was dead, and precisely how much influence he had with the former Prince of Wales, now George II. In answer to Swift's protest the new king, upon advice, found that the Provost "has law on his side" (iii. 399, 403). Shortly thereafter Swift's recommendation of the Earl of Scarborough for the position of Chancellor of T.C.D. was passed over, and Prince Frederick, whom Swift judged "too young", was made Chancellor (iii. 401). Such actions, and others that soon became apparent, dashed once and for all the optimism that Swift and some Tories felt when the death of George I seemed momentarily to promise a mitigation of the warfare between political parties and an end to the Whig régime under Walpole (iii. 400, 402). Within weeks Walpole and the Whigs were back in power, stronger and fiercer than ever, now that they enjoyed the backing of the new queen (iii. 402, n. 4).

The realization that he was within a few months of sixty years of age, that he had, as he believed, "not long to live", are themes that recur in Swift's *Correspondence* of 1727 (iii. 392, 407). They may also explain why he came to make his first will about this time. When he received the news of Stella's fatal illness the futility, as well as the finality, of his frustrated hopes and plans struck him the more forcibly, and he could only look upon the little life he believed left him as a blessing (iii. 416, 417, 418). The sense of time running out, of this as his last and final voyage

¹ "Swift's First Will and the First Use of the Provost's Negative at T.C.D.", *H.J.Q.*, xxi (1958), No. 4, pp. 295-323.

to England, could not help but make his frustrated plans and helpless state the more bitter, a mood which carried over to the Holyhead poems and "Journal".

Finally, Swift would have been inhuman not to have felt chagrin at receiving from such friends as Bolingbroke and possibly Oxford the advice not to publish his *History of the Four Last Years*.¹ Nor could so sensitive a man as Swift have felt anything but mortification when the lengthy and disabling nature of the disease which afflicted him made him become, as he thought, an unsociable guest and a burden to such close friends as Pope and Gay (iii. 410, 422, 428). He was thus denied one of the chief pleasures of his visit, the easy conversation of those closest to him. His present uneasiness and anxiety were further increased by the knowledge of Stella's illness, a concern and uncertainty about her condition which finally drew him back, however unwillingly, to the Dublin he hated.

In his last extant letter to Sheridan before returning, a letter dated 2 September 1727, Swift wrote that "the last act of life is always a tragedy at best, but it is a bitter aggravation to have one's best friends go before one". Soon after his return to Dublin he enlarged upon this theme in a letter to a mother who had lost a child: "For life is a tragedy, wherein we sit as spectators a while, and then act our own part in it" (iii. 417, 436). In the intervening time, and perhaps especially while suffering the exasperating delays and vexations at Holyhead, Swift appears to have cultivated as best he could in the face of adversity the necessary diverting distractions or the stoical endurance of a true philosopher, a detachment from the impending tragedy of Stella's death which he could only achieve by moments, to judge from the "Holyhead Journal". When Stella's death had appeared imminent in 1726 he wrote to Sheridan "I look upon this [Stella's death] to be the greatest event that could ever happen to me; but all my preparations will not suffice to make me bear it like a philosopher, nor altogether like a Christian" (iii. 324). The "Holyhead Journal" is a record of Swift's mind in the midst of a similar crisis.

¹ Davis, *Prose Works*, vii, pp. xii, xiv, n. 1.

II

Swift's "Holyhead Journal" is preserved now in the Victoria and Albert Museum as Forster MS. No. 519. In the Preface (p. viii) to his *Life of Swift* (1875) John Forster said that he had acquired the manuscript of the "Holyhead Journal" from his friend, "The Rev. Dr. Todd, late the senior fellow of Dublin University". A note inside its cover states that "This book was all wrote by Dean Swift, & was M^r Worrall's". The signature of Swift's Dublin friend, John Worrall, is written above and crossed out. Forster died before he could make use of the work in a second volume of his *Life*. Since then the "Journal" has been published by J. Churton Collins,¹ by Sir Henry Craik as an Appendix to his *Life of Swift*,² and by Temple Scott in his edition of Swift's *Prose Works*.³ Most recently Sir Harold Williams has published four poems and a rhymed "proverb" from the "Journal" in his edition of Swift's *Poems*.⁴ A complete and accurate transcription of the entire "Journal" will probably have to wait until the publication of the forthcoming volume of Professor Davis's edition of Swift's *Prose Works*.

Inside the cover of Forster No. 519 Swift has written, by way of explanation and wry jest; "This Book I stole from the Right Hon^{ble} George Dodington Esq^r, one of the Lords of the Treasury June 1727. But the Scribblings are all my own." The first page contains a list of memoranda, in part of expenditures and things to be done by Swift before his leaving England; in part, a shopping list of things to be purchased in London for his Irish friends and for his Cathedral in Dublin.

Forster MS. No. 519, fo. 1.

- I. Memd's those onely done w^{ch} are crossed
Full anthems, and D^r Crofts book
of anthems.

¹ "An Unpublished Diary written by Dean Swift", *The Gentleman's Magazine*, cclii (June 1882), 731-43.

² 2nd edn. (London, 1894), ii. 319-30.

³ *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, 12 vols. (1897-1908). See xi. 391-403. Within the text all references to the "Holyhead Journal" are cited by volume and page number alone.

⁴ 3 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1937). See ii. 418-24. Hereafter cited as *Poems*.

- in Fleet-street about
5. a Clock for St Patr's Cathedral.
Spectacles for 70 years old. 4 pair X
Fenocchio and Brocali original seeds, and
the whole direction about planting them.
Melon seeds, and any othr garden curiosity
 10. Some presents fluid X
A pair of Spectacles for 60, and a large
reading glass for Mr Worrall. X
My Grandfathers Tomb
Pay Pothecary in [Country and] town. X
 15. and pay the Pirmont water X
To [sell] buy 200 ll in some Stock. X
Godfry in Southampton Street. Hungary
water and palsy drops.
Pay lodgings. 1¹¹-11'-6^d X
 20. How to pay M^r Rolt's money X

The first item, as well as the second, are purchases for St. Patrick's Cathedral. Since they are not "crossed", or marked with an "X", apparently they were not made. The blank where the name of a clockmaker in Fleet Street should be may explain why that errand was not done. It is more difficult to understand why Swift failed to buy "D^r Crofts book of anthems". His old friend of Queen Anne's days, the Master of the Chapel Royal, Dr. William Croft, had died only recently at Bath on 14 August.¹ One would expect Swift to buy his book of anthems out of loyalty to his dead friend.

Since Swift himself refused to wear glasses "A pair of Spectacles for 60 [years old ?]" could not be a purchase made for himself. The glasses may have been intended for someone like Mrs. Worrall, in 1727 about sixty years old, to go with the reading glass Swift bought for her husband. The fore-sighted

¹ Abel Boyer, *The Political State of Great Britain*, xxxvi (for August), 1727, 196:

The Day before [14 August 1727], died at *Bath*, the eminent Dr. *Croft's*, Organist and Composer to his Majesty, Master of the Children of the Chappel Royal, and Instrument Keeper and Organist of St. *Peter's Westminster*.

Dr. Croft was buried in Westminster Abbey on 23 August 1727. He is remembered chiefly for his anthems in the tradition of Purcell and Blow. In 1724 he published two folio volumes of anthems and a burial service, part of which is by Purcell.

purchase of four pairs of "Spectacles for 70 years old" might be for the two elderly cousins for whom Swift did a similar errand in 1726. On that occasion Swift had left them behind by accident; John Gay finally sent them off to Dublin by a mutual friend who was going that way.¹ The novelties of fenocchio and broccoli seeds Swift probably got from Pope, who in turn may have had them recently from Italy by way of the Earl of Peterborow. The melon seeds probably came from Pope, too.² "Some presents fluid" and the payments to his apothecary, given the illness with which Swift was afflicted, explain themselves. The £200 to buy "in some Stock" may very well be the money paid Swift by Benjamin Motte, the publisher of *Gulliver's Travels*. Through Pope's urging and with Erasmus Lewis as intermediary, Motte appears to have paid out on 4 May 1727, the £200 which he had promised for six months after the publication of *Gulliver's Travels* (*Corresp.* iii. 330, 386). The payment for lodgings was probably for the inn at Aldersgate Street where, according to Gay, Swift passed his last days in London. It is from there that Swift seems to have taken coach for Chester on 18 September (*Corresp.* iii. 422, 425). "M^r Rolt" may be the son, by her first marriage, of Swift's London nurse, now Mrs. Lancelot. When young Rolt was at Westminster School in 1715 Swift interested himself in the boy's welfare (*Corresp.* ii. 300). "My Grandfathers Tomb" (not crossed) refers to the pious care with which Swift honoured his ancestor, the Royalist rector of Goodrich in Herefordshire. Swift visited his tomb both in 1726 and 1727. On the first occasion he donated a chalice, properly

¹ *Corresp.* iii. 341, 350. Swift thanked Gay and said that "the spectacles were for two old cousins, and not for me".

² In February 1726/7, Pope sent Swift seeds of Italian fennel and broccoli and directions for planting them. Professor Sherburn notes that Charles Mordaunt, third Earl of Peterborow, supplied Pope with his broccoli seeds, at that time a great rarity in England. Pope also grew melons, from whom Swift might also have acquired the melon seeds he lists. Sherburn, *Correspondence of Pope*, ii. 425, n. 4; iv. 6.

In a letter from Twickenham of 1 July 1727, Swift mentioned to Dr. Sheridan that fennochio was then "fit to eat here, and we eat it like celery, either with or without oil, etc." (*Corresp.* iii. 403). In the same paragraph Swift, apparently with this shopping list from the "Holyhead Journal" in mind, asked Sheridan to find out from Stella and Mrs. Dingley "what I should buy for them here of any kind".

inscribed, to his grandfather's church. In 1727 Swift was busy arranging a memorial tablet which was to carry the arms of the Swift family. Swift showed the design for the monument to Mrs. Howard, and she returned it with some comic verses by Pope attached ¹ (*Corresp.* iii. 426, n. 4).

The reference to "Godfry in Southampton Street", a chemist and the vendor of Hungary water and palsey drops, will be mentioned again in another connection.

On the last page of the "Holyhead Journal" Swift noted, writing upside down and in pencil, the names of five of his English Tory friends under the heading "Male Toasts": "Bp Bath & Wells [George Hooper]/Erasmus Lewis/M^r Bromley/Bp. Roches^{tr} [Atterbury]/M^r Pulteney." ² Apparently Swift here refers to their party popularity among the high-flying Tories before September 1727, or to the influence such members of the opposition were optimistically expected to exert in June 1727, when the Whig ministry under Walpole seemed about to fall because of the death of George I.

The bulk of the pocket notebook, however, about twenty pages, is made up of the poems written and the "Journal" kept by Swift while at Holyhead between Sunday, 24 September and

¹ It is relevant to notice here that as late as 1737 Swift himself intended to be buried at Holyhead in England, and not in Ireland. In his second edition of Swift's *Works* (1883), i. 485-6, Sir Walter Scott first published a codicil to Swift's will as it stood in the 1730s. The two leaves of this manuscript in Swift's hand are now in the Henry Huntington Library, San Marino, California (HM 14347). In one place (fo. 1a) the codicil directs Mrs. Whiteway to gather together money "... to pay the charges of transporting my Body to Holyhead and for my Burial in the Church of that Town, as directed in my Will". The codicil is dated "Apr. 16/1727" and it was witnessed and sealed on "April 22, 1737-Seven".

In the 1784 edition of his *Life of Swift* (p. 279) Thomas Sheridan, the younger, refers to a letter from Swift to his father in which Dr. Sheridan was requested to accompany Swift's body to Holyhead to see it buried there. The date of the letter is not given, and the letter itself seems now to be lost.

² Like some of the items in Swift's shopping list this entry in the "Holyhead Journal" can be dated as written before 6 September 1727. According to *D.N.B.* George Hooper, Bishop of Bath and Wells from 1703-27 died on 6 September 1727; on 11 November John Wynne, a Whig, was translated to the bishopric. Swift is here clearly referring to Bishop Hooper and must therefore be writing his list of "Male Toasts" sometime before Hooper's death in early September 1727.

Friday, 29 September 1727. Actually, the "Journal" covers the week between Swift's leaving Chester on horseback at 11 a.m. on Friday, 22 September, and Michaelmas Day, two or three days before Swift finally sailed for Ireland. Misfortune plagued him all the way. As we learn from a letter from Gay to Swift, written on 22 October 1727, the Dean was pursued by an equinocial storm and was forced to land at Carlingford, about sixty miles north of Dublin, where he was met by Dr. Thomas Sheridan.¹ What seems to have happened then is this: Swift showed his "Holyhead Journal" to Sheridan at once, and that merry soul, before leaving Carlingford, secretly dispatched a letter to Gay. Sheridan told of Swift's safe arrival, gave a resumé of the "Holyhead Journal", and urged Gay to astound Swift by writing immediately a knowing account of all that had happened to Swift at Holyhead and afterwards. This was the kind of practical joking that Swift himself had once enjoyed with his friends the Ashes.²

III

The first leaf of the British Museum's Egerton MS. No. 201 has long been recognized to be a series of undated jottings in the hand of Jonathan Swift. The manuscript came into the possession of the Museum from Francis Henry Egerton, the eighth Earl of Bridgewater, whose arms are stamped on the verso of the leaf. At one time it had been in the hands of George Faulkner, Swift's Dublin printer.³ The left-hand edge of the

¹ *Corresp.* iii. 424-7 and notes. Gay remarks that the letter which supplied him with his information was "from Carlingford in Ireland". His correspondent, as F. Elrington Ball noted, could be none other than Sheridan.

² Swift was properly mystified by Gay's detailed knowledge of the "Holyhead Journal" (*Corresp.* iii. 430-1). In March of 1712/13 Swift and Lord Pembroke put Sir Andrew Fountaine up to such a "bite" on Swift's old tutor, St. George Ashe, at that time in London. His brother, Thomas Ashe, in Ireland, played the part which John Gay took in this later "bite" on Swift. See Sir Harold Williams, ed., *Jonathan Swift: "Journal to Stella"*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1948), ii. 641, 653. Hereafter cited as *Journal to Stella*.

³ *List of Additions made to the Collections in the British Museum in the Year MDCCCXXXII*. Printed by Order of the Trustees. London, 1833, p. 21. *Index to the Additional Manuscripts, with those of the Egerton Collection*, . . . Printed by Order of the Trustees. 1849, p. 173.

fragment in the British Museum is jagged, as though torn from other sheets with which it had once been sewn or bound up. Its size (11.5 × 17.7 cm.) and its watermarkings are similar to those of Forster No. 519. An analysis of Swift's jottings on this odd page and a comparison with his "Holyhead Journal" have led me to conclude that the first leaf in Egerton No. 201 was once a page of the stolen notebook in which Swift kept his journal while waiting at Holyhead.

The "Holyhead Journal" is a revealing account in verse and prose of Swift's impatience and utter boredom during that week in late September 1727, when, after the series of frustrations which he had experienced from the time of his arrival in England, he was still more frustratingly detained by adverse winds in the provincial Welsh town of Holyhead, a port of embarkation for Ireland. The delay was demoralizing, and the many attendant difficulties irritated and tried Swift sorely. Only a few days before, on 18 September, he had crept clandestinely away from a brilliant London society that included such close and admired friends as Pope and Gay, at work now upon the *Dunciad* and *The Beggar's Opera*, works in which Swift had almost a paternal interest. Before him, close enough to see on clear days, lay Ireland, "This land of slaves/Where all are fools, and all are Knaves", as he wrote in one of the poems composed at Holyhead. But in that hostile country to which he was returning so reluctantly Esther Johnson also lay seriously ill, perhaps dying, while he sat helplessly stranded between the two worlds of London and Dublin. In order to preserve his sanity, and to occupy his time, Swift scribbled hints and notes to himself, composed verse, and began an intimate journal of anxiety and boredom, written as to an imaginary Irish friend, in order, as he said, "to divert thinking" (xi. 402). As was the case several times before in his earlier life, he was once more forced to live the spider's life: "I live in suspense", he wrote, "which is the worst circumstance of human nature" (xi. 399).

In such a trying moment Swift's physical and spiritual condition could not have been worse. He was weary from days of hard riding over the Welsh mountains; he was worried and still upset and queasy after a long attack of the giddiness and

deafness that had for so long afflicted him.¹ His only companion was a blundering Welsh guide named Wat. His hostess at the inn, Mrs. Welch, had been cleaned out of decent food and liquor by the travellers who left on the packet which Swift so barely missed. The autumnal weather was rainy and uncertain, the shortness of the days prevented reading in the five tedious hours before bedtime, and his recent illness, as well as his anxiety about Stella, caused Swift to sleep badly and to have disturbing dreams. Anyone who has ever been stranded, ill and alone, at a seaside resort out of season in evil weather can appreciate some of Swift's difficulties. In his stolen notebook Swift was reduced to noting down anything that came to mind, from trifles to great thoughts. Some of the trifles, such as the bawdy stories or the puns, are of no great moment. Some other entries, such as the germ of Swift's Holyhead poem, "Shall I repine", the reference to "Godfry a Chymist in Southampton Street", and a list of fashionable expressions in use among polite London society, seem to me to show that the jottings in Egerton No. 201 were made between June and September 1727, and that the leaf was once a part of the "Holyhead Journal" which it so closely resembles.

Egerton MS. No. 201, fo. 1a.

1. Flirtation following a woman, playing with her fan &c
it differs verry little from dangling.

¹ The first day's entry in the "Holyhead Journal" contains an interesting sidelight upon Swift's uneasiness and his attempts to doctor himself, or the stale beer he was forced to drink. Swift wrote (xi. 397):

There was Stale beer, and I tryed a receit of Oyster shells, which I got powdered on purpose; but it was good for nothing.

Actually, in the manuscript, the passage reads, "There was Stale beer, and I tryed Stella's receit . . .". The word *Stella's* is deliberately cancelled, although still easily read, by the same circular strokes that were used to censor passages in the *Journal to Stella*. Stella's "receit" may have been learned at Moor Park, from Sir William Temple, since in his essay "Of Health and long Life" (*Works*, 1757, iii. 298), Sir William mentioned fruits as the best cure, but also:

For all illness of the stomach, or indigestions, proceeding from hot and sharp humours; to which my whole family has been much subject, as well as very many of my acquaintance; and, for which, powdered crabs-eyes [parts of a crayfish] and claws and burnt egg-shells are often prescribed as sweetners of any sharp humours. . . .

Swift himself made fun of the concoction in his punning "Dialogue in the Castilian Language" of 1707 (*Corresp.* i. 376).

Frescamenti

Dolina [?] a Turkish dish—forc'd meat stew'd in Cucumb [?]

5. Kabob

Oddity

quite absolute and papist [?]

Clever universal Bp —

Slight nothing, well pronounced, of consequence [?]

Buzzleers

a Lover. masculine or feminine

10. Mr [?] onelyest way

Curcazo stewd beef with rice the first Tastiest [?] dish

Patlegan [?]

Bumblecasters

Arburman a Roaring drunken feller

15. Tim—a nice finicale man in dress & manner

Ralph. Not quite so civil as a Tim

Roger A downright rough fellow

Dangler that dangles & leads out Ladyes, at an Opera

Fustyes—poor contemptible disagreeable Cousins

20. Godfrey a Chymist in Southampton Street
for Drugs to [?] . . . world [?] &c.¹

The first side of the leaf from the Egerton MS. is hard to decipher, since portions of it are written in pencil, now smudged or faded, and the rest, in ink, is carelessly, even hastily, scribbled. The entire page seems to consist of a series of sometimes unrelated single words recorded down the left-hand margin, many of them glossed to the right. In a few instances, however, the definition of a word is not given, or—if supplied—does not fit the work against which it is written. For example, the first word, "Flirtation", in Swift's hand, is reasonably well defined, in a hand *not* Swift's, as "following a woman, playing with her fan &c it differs verry little from dangling". It is clearly related to "Dangler" (l. 18). "Frescamenti", the second word, is not glossed; it is an Italian musical term meaning "freshly, lightly".

¹ Lines 1-2; 4. The definitions to the right of the words listed are written in a hand that is not Swift's.

Lines 7-13. With the exception of the annotations to the right of lines 8-10, which are in ink, this portion of the manuscript is written in pencil.

Line 11. "Tastiest dish" written above the line.

Line 12. Cancelled. May read "Patlego".

Line 18. "Opera" written above the line.

Lines 20-21. Written in pencil

The third word, "Dolina [?]", may be a term from geological science meaning a sink-hole in certain kinds of limestone, a term not inappropriate to the rough Welsh terrain over which Swift rode on his way to Holyhead.¹ It is improperly glossed, in a hand not Swift's, as "a Turkish dish—forc'd meat stew'd in Cucumb [?]" . Nor could this definition apply to the next word, "Kabob" (the modern *cabob*), a Turkish meat dish, but one that is roasted, not stewed; and one made of chunks of whole meat, not chopped (or "forc'd") meat. Perhaps the gloss is meant to go with the word "Curcazo", lower down on the page (l. 11), which Swift defined as "stew'd beef with rice". The last entry, at the bottom of the page, is a barely decipherable note in pencil about "Godfry a Chymist in Southampton Street" whose name and address appear also among the memoranda of things to be done before leaving London, what is now the first page of the "Holyhead Journal". At the head of that list Swift had noted down to purchase "D^r Crofts book of anthems". Perhaps the musical term "Frescamenti" here listed is in some way connected with that purchase, or else with the music of Italian opera which Swift's friend Gay was at this time busily satirizing in *The Beggar's Opera*. Such highly spiced and exotic dishes as "Kabob" and stewed beef with rice seem foreign to Swift's usually plain tastes in food. He may have met such dishes while being entertained by friends in London.² He may also have longed for such dishes while suffering the inadequate and monotonous diet of Mrs. Welch's bare bleak inn at Holyhead.

¹ My friend Dr. Ronald L. Shreve, of the Geology Division, California Institute of Technology, has helped me to trace this word and its meaning. It is also sometimes spelt, *dolinen*, *doline*. It comes eventually from the Slavic *dolina*, valley. A more detailed description of its technical usage may be found in J. V. Howell *et al.*, *Glossary of Geology and Related Sciences*, National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council (American Geological Institute), Publication No. 501, Washington, D.C., 1957, p. 86. The word may also read "Dolma [?]", a meat dish still served in modern Greece.

² See *Corresp.* iii. 339, 344-5, 377. In September 1726, John Gay sent Swift a rhymed recipe for a highly spiced dish of stewed veal. In 1727, when dining with Bolingbroke at Dawley or with the Earl of Peterborow in London Swift might encounter such "foreign" dishes as he here records. William Pulteney, however, in a letter of 3 September 1727, had promised Swift a plainer fare more to his liking: "... you shall not have one dish of meat at my table so disguised but you shall easily know what it is."

For the most part, however, and most interestingly, the list of words on this page of Egerton No. 201 makes up an amusing cast of characters, as from a Restoration or eighteenth-century comedy of manners. "Bumblecasters" (l. 13), for example, recalls "Mr. Bumblecase", the name of a bungling lawyer who is a very minor character in Wycherley's *Plain Dealer*, a play which Swift had earlier read closely and annotated in a presentation copy inscribed to him from the author.¹ It is also probably the play by Wycherley about which Swift dreamed while at Holyhead.

Swift several times mentions in the "Holyhead Journal" the vivid and disturbing dreams he experienced during this tedious period of waiting. Tuesday, 26 September, was particularly a trying day. Swift's entry for that date is full of "the suspense I am in about my dearest friend . . ." (xi. 398). That night he dreamed a nightmarish dream which he recorded in detail the following morning, Wednesday, 27 September. Swift dreamed that Pope and Bolingbroke were with him in St. Patrick's Cathedral, in the midst of a confused and tumultuous mob among whom were collegians from Trinity College who were said to have broken up the Dean's stall. From the pulpit the unlikely figure of Bolingbroke preached a sermon in which he quoted "Mr. Wycherlye by name, and his Play", an unseemly digression which Swift did not like (xi. 400).

Or, again, among the *dramatis personae* is "Dangler that dangles and leads out Ladies, at an Opera", a description that

¹ Preserved now among the rare books in Henry Huntington Library as No. 121977. The late Godfrey Davies first called attention to this volume in *Shakespeare Survey*, 8 (1953), p. 55 and n. 4. The recto of the fly leaf is inscribed:

For my worthy, learned and
most Ingenious Friend D^r. J: Swift,
from his humble Servant,

W: Wycherley.

The upper right-hand corner of the title-page reads "J Swift. 1709." Bound in with *The Plain Dealer* (edn. of 1700) are *The Country Wife* (1709), *Love in a Wood*, or, *St. James's Park* (1694), and *The Gentleman Dancing-Master* (1702). Swift appears to have read *The Plain Dealer* closely, for his only annotations are in the margins of that play. He has struck or added letters to words on pp. 12, 14, 34. Opposite Manly's speech on p. 7, Act I, sc. I, ll. 330-6: "Hold, hold, Sir, or I shall suspect worse of you, that you have been a Cushion-bearer to some State Hypocrite, and turn'd away by the Chaplains, for out-flattering their Probation Sermons for a Benefice." Swift wrote "very Silly".

echoes the definition, written in another hand at the top of the page, of Swift's word "Flirtation". In June of 1727 Swift had used the new slang word *dangle* about Pope in composing the poem "A Pastoral Dialogue between *Richmond-Lodge* and *Marble-Hill*" (l. 50):

"And here no more will dangle *Pope*."¹

Years later R. B. Sheridan, the grandson of Swift's Irish friend, Dr. Thomas Sheridan, named two of his chief characters "Mr. and Mrs. Dangle" in his play *The Critic* (1779). "Arburman a Roaring drunken feller" and "Tim—a nice finicale man in dress & manner" might be secondary characters in a comedy by someone like Shadwell. "Ralph. Not quite so civil as a Tim" and "Roger A downright rough fellow" might be the insolent or impudent servants from any one of a dozen Restoration comedies.

With the "Fustyes—poor contemptible disagreeable Cousins", however, we may become more precise. That entry, together with some others in the list on this page of Egerton No. 201, establish more conclusively a fact about which we have hitherto had only a suspicion, the fact that Swift sometimes helped John Gay in the composition of plays other than his *Beggar's Opera*. George Faulkner, Swift's Dublin printer, maintained that in 1730 Swift had helped Gay with the writing of one of his later plays, possibly *The Rehearsal at Goatham*.² This page of Egerton No. 201, which was for some time in Faulkner's possession, seems to show that Swift, during his last visit to England in 1727, had noted down a list of words in his pocket notebook that reappeared in somewhat altered form, again as being recorded in the pocket notebook of Miss Friendless, one of the characters in

¹ *Poems*, ii. 409. A Dublin broadside of 1726, "Advice from Fairy-Land", Richmond P. Bond, *English Burlesque Poetry 1700-1750* (Harvard University Press, 1932), p. 329, opens with the lines:

Little Lads of Dublin Town,
Dangling in a Dirty Gown. . . .

A longer Dublin poem called "The Dangler" appears in *The Flower-Piece: A Collection of Miscellany Poems*, by Several Hands (London, 1731), pp. 43-4. O.E.D. cites Swift's usage in the poem of 1727 referred to above for the first appearance the newly popular word *dangle* in the sense that is meant here.

² William H. Irving, *John Gay: Favorite of the Wits* (Duke University Press, 1940), pp. 280, 303.

John Gay's play, *The Distress'd Wife*, first played on 5 March 1733/4, about fifteen months after Gay's sudden death, and published by the Duke of Queensberry nine years later, in 1743.¹

In Act II, scene viii, of *The Distress'd Wife* Gay has his chief female character, the wilful and arrogant Lady Willit, snatch from the pocket of her ward, the pathetic Miss Friendless, a pocket notebook. The latter, an honest, simple girl, also—like Swift—used her notebook to record some of her pitifully innocent expenses since coming up to London from the country with the Willit family.

In a detached and observant fashion that resembles Swift's method in composing *Polite Conversation*, Miss Friendless had also recorded, pretty much as Swift has done in this missing leaf from the "Holyhead Journal", a list of currently fashionable slang words and expressions in use by Lady Willit and her friends. It does not help Miss Friendless, in this embarrassing situation, that she had applied some of the terms to several of the foppish male characters who were hangers-on about Lady Willit, nor that some of the recorded expressions have previously been used by Lady Willit herself. For example, in earlier scenes from Act II Lady Willit has said, with reference to her husband, "I am *not* to be dangled about whenever and wherever his odious Business calls him" (II, i. 25); or she had called out to a servant, "I am not at home this morning—d'ye hear me?—I mean to no Odd-body; to no Formals" (II, iii. 25); "But be sure you let in no Fustyes" (III, v. 27). As Lady Willit reads from Miss Friendless's stolen notebook she interjects her own scornful remarks between entries, remarks which are omitted from the passage which follows from Act II, scene viii (p. 35):

[Lady Willit reads aloud]: "A Collection of the newest Expressions in Use among the fine Gentlemen and Ladies . . .

Having an Affair with a Lady. Being well with a Lady.—Expressions not fit for a modest Pen to explain.

—*To follow a Woman. That is, when a Man takes all Occasions to show the Town that he follows her. . . .*

A Dangler. One that passes his Time with the Ladies; who says nothing,

¹ *Corresp.* v. 58 and John Gay, *The Distress'd Wife*, A Comedy, by the late Mr. Gay, author of *The Beggar's Opera*. London: Printed for John Ashley, at the Rose in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1743. All page references in what follows are from this edition.

means nothing, and whom nothing is meant to. It puts one in mind of Mr. Flutter.— . . .

- *A Flirt. One that gives himself all the Airs of making Love in Publick; that is of vast Consequence to himself, and to Nobody besides.*
- *Something of Mr. Pert.* . . .
- *A fine Man.*— *Just what I take Mr. Pert to be. A Man who know little and pretends to everything.* . . .
- *A pretty Fellow*— *that is, a fine dress'd Man with little Sense and a great deal of Assurance.*— *Mr. Forward is what one may call a pretty Fellow.* . . .
- *The Man is married;*— *that is, hath an extravagant Wife, is hen-peck'd, and Cuckold, like*— *[Lord Willit is meant here].* . . .
- *Fustyes, Formals, and Odd-bodies. That is, her own and her Husband's Relations.* . . .

It should be apparent at once that several of the expressions from Miss Friendless's "Collection of the newest Expressions in Use among the fine Gentlemen and Ladies" echo in expanded form words which Swift had jotted down in this missing leaf from the "Holyhead Journal" of 1727. "Fustyes", a rare word for which *O.E.D.* cites only Gay's usage here in *The Distress'd Wife*, is glossed as the relatives of Lord and Lady Willit. From Lady Willit's fashionable refusal to see them, earlier in Act II, we may suppose that they were the same as Swift's Fustyes—"Poor contemptible disagreeable Cousins". Miss Friendless's definitions of the fashionable expressions "To follow a Woman", "A Dangler" and "A Flirt" resemble Swift's "Dangler that dangles and leads out Ladyes, at an Opera", and the definition written opposite his first word "Flirtation", "following a woman, playing with her fan &c it differs verry little from dangling", a definition, it must be repeated, that is not in the hand of Swift, and may be in the hand of John Gay. Or again, the definition written by Swift in ink, opposite his words in pencil, "Clever universal Bp—" and "Buzzleers", is "Slight nothing, well pronounced of consequence [?] / a Lover. masculine or feminine". It recalls part of Miss Friendless's definition of "A Dangler", ". . . who says nothing, means nothing, and whom nothing is meant to" and also her definition of "A Flirt", "One that gives himself all the Airs of making Love in Publick; that is of vast Consequence to himself, and to Nobody besides". Swift's "Tim—a nice finicale man in dress & manner" might be called "A pretty Fellow—that is, a

fine dress'd Man with little Sense and a great deal of Assurance";¹ his "quite absolute and papist [?]" may be compared to Miss Friendless's definition of "A fine Man. . . . A Man who knows little and pretends to every thing". Swift's "Oddity" may also be the same as Lady Willit's term "Odd-bodies".

It seems to me, therefore, that Swift and Gay must at sometime have collaborated in working out this scene from *The Distress'd Wife* because of the close resemblance of the unusual and slangily fashionable expressions employed by both. Of course there is bound to be some difference between Swift's carelessly written list of words and their definitions as herein presented and the same list, expanded and polished, as it appears several years later in a scene from a finished comedy by Gay. There is also the possibility that Swift merely noted down some of the terms from reading Gay's play in manuscript (if one existed) in the summer of 1727. I have found no suggestion that such a manuscript existed at that time. However, in the summer of 1727 *The Beggar's Opera* was yet to be produced, and Gay, if he were also working upon another play such as *The Distress'd Wife*, would probably have just begun it and might still be casting about for material. Moreover, there are the facts of Swift's constant fatherly interest in Gay's poems and plays; the tradition which credits him with the suggestion of writing a Newgate pastoral, the germ of *The Beggar's Opera*; and Faulkner's specific claim that in 1730 Swift wrote two acts of a play called *The Players' Rehearsal* which Gay was to finish. There is also Swift's habit in composing of noting down in a pocket notebook expressions both old and new, as, for instance, he seems to have done for parts of *Polite Conversation*. All in all, then, it seems to me that the list of expressions recorded in Egerton No. 201 was intended by Swift as a help to Gay for some future play, in 1727 still to be written, a useful collaboration which Gay developed more fully, sometime before his death in 1732, in this scene from the second act of his *Distress'd Wife*.

¹ On 4 March 1712/13 (*Journal to Stella*, ii. 632) Swift, apparently picking up the expression from Stella, had used the term, "a pretty fellow", about Stella's former suitor, the Rev. William Tisdall. By 1727, it had come to mean finicky or foppish in dress and manner, as well as egotistical in speech.

If such were the case, then this page of Egerton No. 201, to have been of use to John Gay, must have been jotted down, as the entries in pencil and in ink and sometimes by another hand suggest, at various times between June 1727, when Swift said he stole the notebook from Dodington, and mid-September, at which time Swift left London for Holyhead and never saw Gay again. The fact that Swift's pocket notebook and Miss Friendless's were both, in their ways, stolen, that they both recorded petty expenditures in London, is almost as striking a coincidence as the fact that both contained lists of rarely used slang expressions, at that moment in 1727 become, for a time, currently fashionable.

IV

The verso of Egerton No. 201 is written throughout in ink and is entirely in Swift's hand. The first three lines are written in a darker ink, with a broader quill, than those that follow. Two letters are missing where the edge of the page is torn, and the deficiency is supplied in brackets. The references to an inn called the Four Crosses, and to "Scarrons Verses", related as that is to Swift's poem "Shall I repine", composed at Holyhead, suggest that this side of the page was written while on the way to Holyhead, or more likely, while Swift was waiting there.

Egerton MS. No. 201, fo. lb.

1. Call for wat^r. bring up p——s complains it stinks, all
wat^r stinks at sea, drink it, 'fell' feel a t—— why di[d]
you bring a toast with it.

A woman crying opium a dose : desires a minding, for she's poor &c.

5. At the 4 crosses, cut in wood on an old Inns window
Fleres si scires totum unum tua tempora mensu[m]
Rides, cum non sit forsitan una dies.

A woman makes a young husband cuckold ; will she not
make an old one so. If this be done in the green tree,—

10. what will they do in the dry.

A fryar had got 5 nuns with child : his excuse to the
Bp was, Ld then had trusted 5 talents. I have made them 10

Scarrons Verses on the destructions made by time ; the
Pyramids dest^{roy}, Rivers, Towns Empires &c decay, and

15. shall I repine that a scurvy black wastcoat, when I
worn it 2 years, is out at elbows. 'th' to the vulgar

some poet says vos &c moderatius iste sub umbras
The thought borrowd from Lucretius tu vero dubitabis

Your ice is best [?], your bread is ill bred, and y^r

20. Oranges are not civil.¹

Here then are some of the "severall useful hints", "every thing that comes into my head", that Swift mentioned in his "Journal" as he was noting them down (xi. 398, 399). They seem literally to include almost anything that came to his mind. The nauseous posset cup of the first entry, as well as some others, are scurrilous enough stories to be intended for Dr. Thomas Sheridan.² The Latin verses are from the window of an inn, at which, by tradition, Swift is supposed to have stopped and written some scathing words upon the window-pane about his shrewish hostess.³ The detached philosophy of these Latin lines would have appealed to Swift in his present temper, in much the same way that Scarron's verses on the ravages of time appealed. The general observation of an antifeminist kind, about the woman who cuckolds her husband, is proverbial and sounds like an entry from Swift's "Thoughts on Various Subjects". The story of the friar and five nuns may also have been intended for Sheridan; set off in brackets at the top of the second leaf of the "Holyhead Journal" is a memorandum that reads "(Rememb^r the Abbot when you write to S——)". At any rate, the whole story, with its implied reference to Matthew XXV, was later versified as follows, by someone signing himself "Roscius", for the Prize Epigram contest of *The Gentleman's Magazine* where it was published in March 1735:⁴

¹ Line 2. "fell" deleted.

Line 6. "totum" deleted.

Line 16. "th" deleted.

Line 19. "your" repeated.

² "A toast" (as in the first story) was dried bread floated upon liquor when served.

³ See *Poems*, ii. 403-9, where four versions of Swift's epigram "At the Sign of the Four Crosses" are presented, as in the following:

To the Landlord.

There hang three crosses at thy door:

Hang up thy wife, and she'll make four.

⁴ Vol. v. p. 157. It is worth noticing that, by 1735, the story, when versified, seems to be aimed now at a particular bishop, one who has, in his time, also sired bastards.

Epigram 1.

Five holy sisters buxom, young and fair,
 Were giv'n to fryar Antonio's pious care,
 They edify'd so fast e'er *Sol* had run
 Thro' ten caelestial signs, each bore a son :
Antonio call'd to answer his misdeeds,
 Thus in excuse before his Bishop pleads,
 Five talents, rev'rend Sir, t' improve were giv'n,
 Five more are gain'd, so well my care has thriv'n :
 The Bishop smil'd, and took the fryar to grace,
 For why, 'twas once it seems his lordship's case.

The puns about " civil " Seville oranges and " ill bred " bread were exactly the kind of word play that Swift's one time friend, Sir Richard Steele, had attacked in a *Spectator* paper as a form of the " false wit " of which Swift was so fond.¹ Since ice is ice, no ice can be " best ", an English or Irish " bull " of the kind Swift sometimes noted down for his friend Sheridan's collection.²

By far the most important entry on this side of the leaf from the Egerton MS., however, is the passage about Scarron's verses and their relationship to the composition of Swift's autobiographical poem written at Holyhead, " Shall I repine ". By establishing the connection between Swift's reference to Scarron here, and the tentative first draft as well as the finished version of that poem, both contained in Forster MS. No. 519, it may be shown that the first leaf of the Egerton MS. is, in fact, a missing page from the " Holyhead Journal ". In passing, something of Swift's methods of composing verse may be seen.

¹ Steele's *Spectator*, No. 504 (for Wednesday, 8 October 1712) was aimed mainly at Swift's great game of the " bite ", but by way of introduction Steele also attacked the punning at which Swift excelled :

Thus if you talk of a Candel, he [the punster] *can deal* with you ; and if you ask to help you to some Bread, a Punster should think himself ill *bred* if he did not . . .

² See " Swift's Games with Language in Rylands English MS. 659 ", *B.J.R.L.*, vol. 36, No. 2 (March 1954), pp. 424-32. Faulkner, in his 1735 edition of Swift's *Works* (ii. 372), prefaces the poem of 1727, " A Pastoral Dialogue Between *Richmond-Lodge* and *Marble-Hill* " with a note that may have been supplied by Swift about Marble Hill, Mrs. Howard's estate : " *Mr. Pope was the Contriver of the Gardens, Lord Herbert the Architect, and the Dean of St. Patrick's Chief Butler and Keeper of the Ice House.* " In this latter capacity Swift may have heard some Englishman perpetrate the Irish " bull " of saying " Your ice is best ". Since Swift was on the lookout for so-called " Irish bulls " committed by Englishmen, he might then write it down for Sheridan's collection.

George Faulkner, once the owner of this fragment of Swift's writing, noted in his 1735 Dublin edition of Swift's *Works* (ii. 334) that "Scarron hath a larger Poem on the same Subject", a note that Swift himself may have supplied. Swift's remarks here would explain and amplify Faulkner's footnote, and they direct us to the poem by Scarron which Swift had in mind, as well as to a still more famous passage by a far greater poet of antiquity, Lucretius, whose stoic philosophy underlies Swift's poem and Scarron's. As his entry here makes clear, Swift began by remembering Paul Scarron's sonnet beginning "Superbes monumens de l'orgueil des humains" (1650),¹ what Swift here calls "Scarrons Verses on the destructions made by time". On 19 August 1727, Swift wrote to Mrs. Howard to say that, in spite of his persistent giddiness and deafness, "I have been as cheerful as Scarron" (*Corresp.*, iii. 414). He may have been reading the French poet while at Twickenham and thus would have the sonnet still in mind. It concludes with the lines :

Si vos marbres si durs ont senty son pouvoir,
Dois-je trouver mauvais qu' un meschant pourpoint noir
Qui m'a duré deux ans soit percé par le coude ?

The last two lines Swift appears to have recalled because of his own mood and situation, to have remembered them with accuracy, and to have translated them quite brilliantly by the prose statement, "Shall I repine that a scurvy black wastcoat, when I [have] worn it 2 years, is out at elbows". In the finished version of the six line poem the final thought is altered by toning it down, the "wastcoat" becomes a "cassock", and the whole thought is depersonalized by being put into the mouth of "a Welch Divine" :

Shall I repine
If neither brass nor marble can withstand
The mortal force of Time's destructive hand
If mountains sink to vales, if cities dye
And lessening rivers mourn their fountains dry
When my old cassock says a Welch divine
It out at elbows why should I repine ?

Originally, as Sir Harold Williams has noticed,² the last two

¹ Marcel Cauchie, ed., *Paul Scarron : "Poesies Diverses"* (Paris, 1947), p. 496 and note. The Sonnet is quoted from this edition in what follows.

² *Poems*, ii. 419 and notes.

lines of the finished version of the poem in the "Holyhead Journal" read :

When the old cassock of a Welch divine
Is out at elbows why should he repine

In the "Holyhead Journal" there is also a cancelled and barely decipherable version of the poem in four lines. It is an intermediate and tentative first draft that stands halfway between Swift's translated prose statement from Scarron in the Egerton MS. and the finished poem as it existed with its original two lines concluding in the "Holyhead Journal". I read these four lines as follows :

thredbare
Because my 'shabby' sable wastcoats torn
Full
'At' two years old, or out at ebows [sic] worn
To see the cassock of a poor divine
Worn out at elbows, why should he repine

Here the first two lines are merely a rearrangement in more poetic form of Swift's prose statement in the Egerton MS. about his "scurvy black wastcoat". The last two lines are very close to what Swift originally wrote as the last two lines of the finished version of the poem in the "Holyhead Journal".

The first four lines of the finished poem are very imaginative and generalized amplifications of the remembrance of all of Scarron's sonnet, the thought with which Swift started, about "The destructions made by time", and they appear to have given Swift little trouble. They are perhaps the more poignant because of his own helpless situation at Holyhead. They are made even more so by Swift's recollection of some lines of verse and their philosophic overtones that inform his and Scarron's poems, as Swift noted here in the Egerton MS., "the thought borrowd from Lucretius" eventually, from a famous passage near the end of Book III of *De Rerum Natura*. The passage which Swift had in mind is composed of the eight lines which follow hard upon Lucretius's famous tribute to his master, Epicurus, and they are lines that breathe, in the face of adversity, the stoically detached and truly philosophic outlook, *sub species aeternitatis*, which Swift, in September 1727, was trying so desperately to cultivate :

tu vero dubitabis et indignabere obire ?
 mortua cui vita est probe iam vivo atque videnti,
 qui somno partem maiorem conteris aevi
 et vigilans stertis nec somnia cernere cessas
 sollicitatemque geris cassa formidine mentem
 nec reperire potes tibi quid sit saepe mali, cum
 ebrius urgeris multis miser undique curis
 atque animi incerto fluitans errore vagaris.¹

¹ *Lucretius : De Rerum Natura*, translated by W. H. D. Rouse (Loeb Classical Library, 1924), p. 242 (Book III, ll. 1045-52). According to an account in his own hand Swift read Lucretius three times in 1697. In 1704 he used a motto from Lucretius on the title page of *A Tale of a Tub*. See D. Nichol Smith, ed., *A Tale of a Tub*, 2nd edn. (Oxford University Press, 1958), pp. lvi, 1. In 1682 Thomas Creech translated the passage as follows :

Then how dar'st *thou* repine to die, and grieve,
 Thou *Meaner Soul*, thou *dead*, e'en whilst alive ?
 That sleep'st and dream'st the most of Life away :
Thy Night is full as rational as thy Day ;
 Still vext with *Cares*, who never understood
 The Principles of *Ill*, nor use of *Good*,
 Nor whence thy *Cares* proceed, but reel'st about
 In vain unsettled thoughts, condemn'd to doubt.

THE EXEGESIS OF SCRIPTURE AND THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY

By T. E. POLLARD, B.A., B.D., PH.D.

I

THE last decade has witnessed a sudden revival of interest, particularly among Roman Catholic scholars, in the Patristic exegesis of Scripture. The starting-point of this revival, at least as far as Roman Catholic scholars are concerned, may be traced to the Papal Encyclical, *Divino afflante Spiritu* (1943), which said,

It is indeed regrettable that such precious treasures of Christian antiquity are almost unknown to many writers of the present day, and that students of the history of exegesis have not yet accomplished all that seems necessary for the due investigation and appreciation of so momentous a subject.¹

The revival of interest in Patristic exegesis is concerned not only with the actual interpretation of the Scriptures by the Fathers, but also with the principles of exegesis, either implicit or explicit, which the Fathers employ. Closely allied with this study of exegesis is the problem of the relation between Scripture and Tradition, which has been a bone of contention between the Roman and Reformed Churches since the Reformation, and which has risen again in an acute form in the ecumenical discussions between the Protestant Churches of the West and the Orthodox Churches of the East. Apart from external stimuli, too, the question of the validity of exegetical principles arises within Protestant theology as a result of the revived interest in Biblical Theology. Both these questions—exegetical method and the relation between Scripture and Tradition—played an important part in the Arian and Marcellan controversies in the first half of the fourth century, and it was the theology which was based on the soundest exegetical principles, which understood most clearly the true relation between Scripture and Tradition, and

¹ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 35 (1943), 312 ff.; quoted by A. Kerrigan, *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, Intro. p. v.

which sought to take most seriously the theology of the Bible, that was victorious in them and became established as the orthodox theology of the Church.

A later generation witnessed a bitter conflict¹ between the exegetical methods of Antioch and Alexandria. The Antiochene theologians emphasized the literal and typological senses of Scripture and eschewed the allegorical interpretation to which the Alexandrians were addicted. In the Arian and Marcellan controversies, however, this conflict plays no significant or influential part. Arius inherited from Lucian of Antioch a literalistic method of exegesis; Eustathius of Antioch and Marcellus of Ancyra, true sons of Antioch, had no interest in allegory—indeed, the former wrote a strong criticism of Origen's allegorical interpretation of 1 Samuel xxviii. 7 in his *de Engastrimytho contra Origenem*; Eusebius of Caesarea, for all his reverence for Origen, concentrated on the literal and typological sense of Scripture;² Athanasius (and the author of the Pseudo-Athanasian *Fourth Oration against the Arians*) inherited from his predecessors in the See of Alexandria, Alexander and Peter the Martyr, an aversion to the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture, at least as a basis for the formulation of doctrine. All of the antagonists in these controversies, then, were primarily interested in the literal interpretation of Scripture, and it was on this ground that the battles were fought. In this paper I am mainly concerned with the exegetical principles which the Arians used, those which Athanasius employed in his refutation of them, and those which Pseudo-Athanasius used in his refutation of Marcellus.

II

1. *The Arians*

From Lucian, their Antiochene teacher, the early Arians

¹ Or was it only a misunderstanding? Cf. J. Guillet, "Les exégèses d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche : conflit ou malentendu?" in *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, xxxiv (1947), 257-302. Cf. also H. S. Nash, "The Exegesis of the School of Antioch" in *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, xi (1892), Pt. I, 22-38.

² "Eusebius is led naturally to accept the principle of allegorical exegesis; but his temperament as a historian prevents him from going too far in this sense." (G. Bardy, "Interpretation chez les Pères" in *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supp. vol. iv, col. 576 f.).

inherited a method of Biblical criticism and exegesis which they appear to have carried to extremes. We have no direct evidence of the exegetical methods of Lucian, but it is possible to discover something of it from his recension of the Scriptures. As Père G. Bardy says, "Any translation, any recension of a text assumes an interpretation; and even if the details of this interpretation escape us, it is still possible to recover its guiding principles".¹ Bardy goes on to list the following characteristics of the Lucianic recension, and his list agrees with that of H. P. Smith² and that of F. Field:³

In the foremost place there is to be found a very great preoccupation with clarity; Lucian adds to the received text precise terms in order to make the meaning clearer; he replaces pronouns with proper names; he introduces new words to make an obscure passage clear; he fills in blanks in the narrative. Often he seems to wish to approximate more closely to the Hebrew, but such is not, as it was for Origen, his dominating preoccupation. He appears above all to be anxious to give a text which is easy to read and interpret, to erase all ambiguities, all unprecise terms, which could receive a meaning only with the help of allegorical exegesis. Such principles are at the beginning of the literalistic exegesis which was to remain in such high honour in the Antiochene School, and it is without doubt because the Antiochenes recognized in the Lucianic recension the mark of their own spirit that they adopted it in preference to any other.⁴

That the Arians were extreme literalists is borne out by Athanasius's criticism of them. He criticizes them, however, not because they interpret the Scriptures literally, but because they isolate carefully selected texts from their context and interpret them literally without any regard for their context or for the general teaching of Scripture. The Arians claimed that their doctrine was Scriptural and that that of the Nicene Council was not. They continually criticized the Council for introducing terms which could not be found in Scripture—*ὁμοούσιον* and *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός*. Athanasius, however, turned this argument against them by pointing out that they themselves, for all their claims to be Scriptural, set forth their doctrine in terms which were unscriptural *per se* and unscriptural in the meaning which is given to them. For example, Athanasius asks them:

¹ G. Bardy, *Paul de Samosate*, p. 408.

² *Commentary on Samuel* (ICC), pp. 420 ff.

³ *Origenis Hexapla quae supersunt*, p. lxxx.

⁴ *Paul de Samosate*, p. 408.

In what Scripture did they, on their part, find "unoriginate", and the term "essence", and "there are three hypostases", and "Christ is not very God", and "He is one of the hundred sheep", and "God's Wisdom is unoriginate and without beginning, but the created powers are many, of which Christ is one".¹

He says :

They may be convicted on this score, that, while blaming the Nicene Bishops for using phrases which are not in Scripture, although these are not harmful but are subversive of their irreligion, they themselves went off on the same error, that is, they used words which are not in Scripture.²

The Arians fell into error, just as Noetus and Praxeas had done before them,³ because they were too literal in their interpretation of selected texts isolated from their context and interpreted, not in the light of the whole teaching of the Bible, but in the light of their own extra-biblical presuppositions.

2. *The Tropici*

Before passing on to discuss the exegetical method which Athanasius opposed to the "selective literalism" of the Arians, a few words must be said about the question of the "tropical exegesis" which Athanasius attacks in his letters to Serapion. The *Tropici* were orthodox in their view of the relation of the Son to the Father, but they adopted an Arian view of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son and the Father; they held that the Spirit is a creature. Athanasius accuses them of "trope-mongering", of using τροποί in their interpretation of the Scriptures.⁴ Usually τροπός means "a figurative expression" in this connection, but it is difficult to see in what way the *Tropici* used figurative expressions any more than their opponents did. Athanasius's criticism of their exegesis makes it plain that it was of exactly the same kind as that of the Arians. They selected isolated passages of Scripture, interpreted them literally without any regard to the context, and drew from their literal

¹ *de Synodis*, 36 (PG, xxvi, 757); cf. *ad Epp. Aeg.*, 3; 4; *de Decretis*, 12, 15; 18; 28; 32; *ad Afros*, 6.

² *Or. c. Ar.* i, 30 (PG, xxvi, 73).

³ Cf. Hippolytus, *contra Noetum*, 3; Tertullian, *adv. Praxean*, 20; Novatian, *de Trinitate*, 16.

⁴ *Ep. ad Serapionem*, i, 2 (PG, xxvi, 532); cf. C. R. B. Shapland, *The Letters of Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit*, p. 62.

interpretations conclusions which were contrary to the teaching of Scripture as a whole.

Athanasius makes a detailed examination of their exegesis of three texts—Amos iv. 13, 1 Timothy v. 21, and Zechariah i. 9—from which they drew the conclusion that the Spirit is a creature. According to him they interpreted 1 Timothy v. 21 thus :

The *Tropici* . . . have dared to devise for themselves *tropes* and to pervert also the saying of the Apostle which he blamelessly wrote to Timothy, saying, ' I charge thee in the sight of God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels that thou observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality '. But they say that, because he mentions God and Christ and then the angels, the Spirit must be counted with the angels and Himself belong to their category and be an angel greater than the others.¹

Commenting on this passage, Shapland remarks that " it is difficult to see in what sense Athanasius could describe the inference drawn by the *Tropici* from this verse as a trope. The term can mean no more than that they refused to be satisfied with the bare sense of Scripture, but drew speculative conclusions from it."²

Similarly it is difficult to see in what sense their exegesis of Amos iv. 13, " I am he that establisheth thunder and createth spirit ", from which they drew the conclusion that the Spirit is a creature, can be called a trope. Their exegetical method is identical with that which the Arians used : they draw speculative conclusions from a few isolated verses of Scripture and ignore the context of the verses and the witness of Scripture as a whole. Against this subjective and individualistic method of exegesis, Athanasius lays down clearly formulated rules for the correct interpretation of Scripture.

III

Athanasius and Pseudo-Athanasius ³

In his early ante-Nicene writings, *contra Gentes* and *de*

¹ *Ep. ad Serap.* i, 10 (PG, xxvi. 556) ; tr. Shapland, op. cit. p. 56.

² Loc. cit. note 10.

³ I am not entirely convinced that the *Fourth Oration against the Arians* is pseudonymous. In any case, its thought is so close to that of the writings of Athanasius that some connection between its author and Athanasius must be assumed.

Incarnatione Verbi Dei, Athanasius shows that he has not completely broken away from the old Alexandrian tradition of allegorical exegesis,¹ but its influence is slight and insignificant. In his later writings in refutation of Arianism he concentrates his attention on the literal meaning of Scripture. It may be true that, as Shapland says, "Athanasius does not question its legitimacy",² but the pressure of the controversy made him avoid allegorical interpretations. He was not a professional exegete, but he looks to the Bible for proof of the falseness of the teachings of the Arians. His starting-point in all his arguments against them is the word of Scripture itself, which he interprets according to clearly defined exegetical principles. The same principles are emphasized by the author of the *Fourth Oration against the Arians* in his criticism of both the teachings of the Arians and those of Marcellus of Ancyra.

(i) The first principle which Athanasius emphasizes is *the sufficiency of Scripture*. In the opening paragraph of his earliest treatise he asserts that "the sacred and divine Scriptures are sufficient to declare the truth",³ and he apologizes to his readers for writing on a subject about which Scripture has already said sufficient. Throughout his writings he emphasizes this same principle. "Holy Scripture is of all things most sufficient for us,"⁴ "Divine Scripture is sufficient above all things."⁵ He was always ready, as Keble said,⁶ "to commit his cause to the witness of Scripture, and to follow the voice of Scripture wherever it should lead him". He attempts to refute his opponents by no rationalistic or speculative arguments, but solely on the basis of "what the divine Scriptures say". Often he challenges the Arians to produce the passage from Scripture which supports their teaching on some point, and then proceeds to show how they are involved in self-contradiction. He sets over against their teaching words of Scripture which are contrary to their opinions, frequently being content to cite a *florilegium* of texts which contradict a proposition which the Arians have supported by a single isolated text.

¹ Cf. *contra Gentes*, 2 f. (PG, xxv. 5-9) and *de Inc.*, 35 (PG, xxv. 156 f.)

² Op. cit. p. 77, note 2.

³ c. *Gent.* 1 (PG, xxv. 4 f.).

⁴ *ad Epp. Aeg.*, 4 (PG, xxv. 548).

⁵ *de Synodis*, 6 (PG, xxvi. 689).

⁶ Quoted by W. Bright, *The Age of the Fathers*, i. 87.

Athanasius's emphasis on the sufficiency of Scripture, however, raises the question of the place of tradition and its relation to Scripture. In the Western Church the *regula fidei* was a limiting factor in the exegesis of Scripture,¹ but the same does not appear to have been the case, at least to the same extent, in the Eastern Church. Against the Gnostic claim to a secret tradition, Clement of Alexandria set, not the *regula fidei* of the Church, but the true secret tradition, the *γνωστικὴ παράδοσις*, which he claims to have received from his teachers.² Athanasius seldom appeals to tradition in his refutation of the Arians and the Tropicists; when he does appeal to it, however, it is usually in close relation to the appeal to Scripture. In his letter *ad Adelphium*, for example, he says,

Our faith is right, and starts from the teaching of the Apostles and tradition of the Fathers, being confirmed both by the New Testament and by the Old.³

In the same passage he introduces a quotation of 1 Peter iv. 1 with the words, "while the apostolic tradition teaches in the words of the blessed Peter".⁴ In his first letter to Serapion he writes:

Let us look at the very tradition, teaching and faith of the Catholic Church from the beginning, which the Lord gave, the Apostles preached, and the Fathers kept. Upon this the Church is founded, and he who should fall away from it would not be a Christian, and should no longer be so-called. There is, then, a Triad, holy and complete, confessed to be God in Father, Son and Holy Spirit. . . . Less than these the Catholic Church does not hold lest she sink to the level of the modern Jews, imitators of Caiaphas, and to the level of Sabellius. Nor does she add to them by speculation, lest she be carried into the polytheism of the heathen. And that they may know this to be the faith of the Church, let them learn how the Lord, when sending forth the Apostles, ordered them to lay this foundation for the Church, saying, "Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit". The Apostles went and taught thus; and this is the preaching that extends to the whole Church which is under heaven.⁵

In this passage Athanasius equates *tradition* (παράδοσις), *teaching* (διδασκαλία), *faith* (πίστις), and *preaching* (κήρυγμα).

¹ Cf. Tertullian, *de Praescriptione*, 14.

² *Stromateis*, i. 1, 15 (GCS. ii. 11, line 19); on the concept of tradition in the Church of Alexandria, cf. R. P. C. Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition*.

³ *ad Adelphium*, 6 (PG, xxvi, 1080).

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ep. ad Serap.* i. 28 (PG. xxvi. 593 f.).

In the passage already quoted from *ad Adelphium* 6 he equates παράδοσις and διδασκαλία, while in *de Decretis*, describing the conduct of Eusebius of Caesarea at the Council of Nicaea, he equates παράδοσις and πίστις :

What is strange indeed, Eusebius of Caesarea in Palestine, who had refused the day before, but afterwards subscribed, sent to his Church a letter in which he said that this was the Church's faith and the tradition of the Fathers.¹

The teaching and faith of the Church are "traditioned" to it from Christ Himself through the Apostles and the Fathers;² it is "the sound faith which Christ bestowed upon us, the Apostles preached, and the Fathers at Nicaea . . . have handed down".³

It is important to ask to what exactly Athanasius is appealing in these passages. In *ad Adelphium* 6 and *Ep. ad Serapionem* i, 28, he makes it plain that when he is appealing to tradition he is not appealing to something which is independent of Scripture or supplementary to it. In *Ep. ad Serapionem* i, 28 "neither is he appealing to the authority of the earlier Fathers. . . . The real direction of Athanasius's appeal is to be understood from the citation of the Baptismal formula later on. It is of the faith as delivered, expounded and confessed in baptism that he is thinking".⁴ Tradition is not a source of doctrine apart from or supplementary to Scripture; it is rather the πίστις, διδασκαλία and κήρυγμα which have been handed down through the ages from the Lord Himself and the Apostles. For Athanasius, then, tradition, the *regula fidei*, is a summary of the teaching of Christ and of the preaching of the Apostles, a summary used from very early times in the instruction of catechumens and based on the Baptismal formula of Matthew xxviii. 19. As such it is also a summary of the message of the New Testament which is the precipitate of the Apostolic preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Robertson says that "tradition with Athanasius is a formal, not a material source of doctrine".⁵ Previously he has said

¹ *de Decr.* 3 (PG. xxv. 430 f.); note that columns 425-56 in PG. xxv. should be numbered 417-48.

² Cf. *Apol. c. Ar.*, 37 (PG. xxv. 312 f.).

³ *ad Afros*, 1 (PG. xxvi. 1029).

⁴ Shapland, *op. cit.* p. 134.

⁵ *Athanasius (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd Series, vol. iv),* Introd. p. lxxiv.

that Athanasius recognizes tradition as authoritative in two ways: "negatively, in the sense that doctrines which are novel are *prima facie* condemned by the very fact; and positively, as furnishing a guide to the sense of Scripture". If tradition with Athanasius is only a "formal" source of doctrine, it is difficult to see how it can fulfil either of these two functions. If Robertson means that tradition provides a Trinitarian form for doctrine, then, in doing so, tradition must also be a material source of doctrine. Athanasius, however, goes back to the very beginning of tradition, to what Jesus Himself "gave", and to the kerygma of the Apostles, to the Baptismal formula which itself provides a tripartite form for the *regula fidei*. For Athanasius the authority of tradition is the authority of Scripture, for Scripture and tradition developed side by side, the former being the precipitate of the revelation of God in Christ,¹ and the latter the concentrated essence of that revelation.

Athanasius, then, rarely appeals to tradition, for he knows that all that tradition has to say is said more fully and more sufficiently in Scripture. When he does appeal to tradition it is always in close relation to his appeal to Scripture. The emphasis of Athanasius, the greatest of the defenders of the Church's faith against heresy, on the sufficiency of Scripture is in itself the refutation of Père van den Eynde's assertion that "Scripture is insufficient to maintain the faith and to resolve controversial questions . . . it needs to be explained by tradition".²

(ii) Closely connected with his principle of the sufficiency of Scripture is Athanasius's appeal to *the scope of Scripture*, and this throws further light on the place which tradition holds in his thought. It is by appeal to the scope of Scripture that he refutes Arian arguments based on literal interpretation of isolated

¹ Cf. E. Fleeseman-van Leer, *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*, p. 192.

² *Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles*, p. 280. For a point of view close to that put forward here, cf. the articles by L. Bouyer and H. E. Symonds in the supplementary number of *The Eastern Churches Quarterly*, vol. vii (1947), entitled *Tradition and Scripture*. Symonds says, "It would seem therefore that the sufficiency of Scripture as containing all necessary doctrine is taught by the *consensus patrum*" (p. 70).

verses of Scripture. No doctrine, he argues, can be based on an isolated verse of Scripture unless it is in harmony with the general teaching of the whole of Scripture. In a key passage in the *Third Oration against the Arians*, Athanasius connects tradition with Scripture by equating *the scope of tradition* with *the scope of Scripture*. He says :

What has been briefly said above may suffice to show their misunderstanding of the passages which they then alleged ; and that they certainly give an unsound interpretation of what they now allege from the Gospels we may easily see, if we consider the scope (σκοπός) of that faith which we Christians hold, and, using it as a rule (κάνων), apply ourselves, as the Apostle teaches, to the reading of inspired Scripture. For Christ's enemies, being ignorant of this scope, have wandered from the way of truth, and have stumbled on a stone of stumbling, thinking otherwise than they should think. Now the scope and character of Holy Scripture is this : it contains a double account of the Saviour, that He was ever God, and is the Son, being the Father's Logos and Radiance and Wisdom, and that afterwards for us He took flesh from a Virgin, Mary Bearer of God, and was made man. And this scope is to be found throughout inspired Scripture.¹

From the first part of this passage it appear that Athanasius is laying down the principle that the *regula fidei* is to be used as a rule (κάνων) for the interpretation of Scripture ; to conclude from that, however, that he is contradicting his own principle of the sufficiency of Scripture, would be a mistake. To discover the whole of his meaning it is necessary to ask what he means by the word σκοπός, and by the phrases " the scope of that faith which we Christians hold " and " the scope and character of Holy Scripture ".

Transliteration of the word σκοπός as " scope " does not convey the meaning of the word for Athanasius, nor is the meaning conveyed by such translations as " intention ", " end " or " purpose ". Athanasius's meaning can be conveyed only by some phrase such as " the general bearing or drift ".² The " scope of faith " is " the general drift of faith ", and so also with the " scope of Scripture ".

¹ *Or. c. Ar. iii.* 28-29 (PG. xxvi. 384 f.).

² Newman, in Robertson, *Athanasius*, p. 409, note 8. The Reformers also appealed frequently to the scope of Scripture ; cf. G. D. Henderson, *Religious Life in 17th Century Scotland*, p. 21 : " We find the word employed explicitly by Dickson, Durham, Hutcheson, Ferguson, and Nisbet. The idea was applied by Luther, and from him by Matthias Flaccius. . . . It means ' corpus ipsum ', the intention, end or purpose of what the author has written."

In another passage in the *Third Oration*, Athanasius speaks of "the ecclesiastical scope":

Had Christ's enemies . . . recognized the ecclesiastical scope as an anchor for the faith, they would not have made shipwreck of the faith.¹

Under this phrase "ecclesiastical scope" "he comprehends the meaning and aim of the οἰκονομία, i.e. of the Incarnation as a means towards the reconciliation and reunion of God and man, till then estranged by sin".² This "ecclesiastical scope" is the scope both of that faith which we Christians hold and of inspired Scripture. Athanasius does not define "the scope of faith", but he says that "the scope of Scripture" is that it contains a double account of the Saviour, as both God and man, and it is this "scope of Scripture" that he uses as a rule (κάνων) for interpreting Scripture. It is evident that he considers the "scope of faith" and the "scope of Scripture" to be identical; the whole passage bears witness to the close connection between the two in his thought. The ecclesiastical scope, which is at once the scope of faith and the scope of Scripture, must be used as the "rule" for the interpretation of Scripture. By appealing to this scope Athanasius is simply asserting the principle that Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture, the part in the light of the whole. He would have agreed with a much later statement:

The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and, therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.³

When he appeals to the scope of Scripture, Athanasius is appealing to the witness of Scripture as a whole over against what might be deduced from any single isolated passage or verse. His method of arguing against the Arians is frequently as follows: the passage to which the Arians refer appears to say what they think it does, but when we read it in the light of the general drift of the teaching of Scripture, or in the light of all the other passages which refer to the same subject, their interpretation

¹ *Or. c. Ar. iii. 58 (PG. xxvi. 440).*

² L. Bouyer, "Holy Scripture and Tradition as seen by the Fathers", in *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, vii (1947), Supp., pp. 3 f.

³ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, ch. i, ix.

is manifestly false. For example, the Arians argue : “ How can the Son be from the Father by nature, and be like Him in essence, who says, ‘ All power is given unto me ’ (Matt. xxviii. 18), and ‘ The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son ’ (John v. 22), and ‘ The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into His hand ’ (John iii. 35), and so on? ”¹ Athanasius replies that the Arians are ignoring the scope of Scripture which speaks of Christ in two ways, referring either to His eternal being as Son of God, or to His incarnate being as Son of Mary ; any passages which refer to the Son’s being created, or made, or to His receiving from the Father, refer to Him as incarnate ; therefore we cannot deduce from them that the Son, in His eternal being, is a creature. That is, we must take into account the scope of Scripture before we draw doctrinal conclusions from any isolated passage.

(iii) Along with this appeal to the scope of Scripture, Athanasius also frequently appeals to *the custom with Scripture* (ἔθος τῆ γραφῆς), as, for example, in the following passages :

It is the custom with divine Scripture to take the things of nature as images and illustrations for mankind ; and this it does in order that from these physical objects the moral impulses of man may be explained, and thus their conduct shown to be either bad or righteous.²

And again

It is the custom with Scripture to call man by the name of “ flesh ”.³

Similarly Pseudo-Athanasius says :

It is the custom with Scripture to speak and signify in the way of man what is above man. . . . Suitable then is its language about everything.⁴

and

This is the custom with Scripture, to express itself in unartificial phrases.⁵

When he appeals to “ the custom with Scripture ”, Athanasius is applying to the language of Scripture the same principle as he applies to the teaching of Scripture when he appeals to the scope of Scripture. In other words, both in its thought and in its language Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture.

It must be remembered that for Athanasius the Old Testament was the Septuagint, and that in his arguments from “ the custom

¹ *Or. c. Ar.* iii. 26 (PG. xxvi. 377).

² *Ibid.* iii. 18 (PG. xxvi. 360 f.).

³ *Ibid.* iii. 30 (PG. xxvi. 383).

⁴ *Ibid.* iv. 27 (PG. xxvi. 509).

⁵ *Ibid.* iv. 33 (PG. xxvi. 517).

with Scripture" he could draw on the usage of the same Greek word in both Testaments. The best example among many is to be found in his criticism of the "tropical" exegesis of Amos iv. 13, by which the Tropici proved that the Holy Spirit is a creature. They read there that God said, "I am he that establisheth thunder and createth spirit"; therefore, they said, the Spirit is a creature. In reply, Athanasius asks them:

Tell us, then, is there any passage in the divine Scripture where the Holy Spirit is found simply referred to as "spirit" without the addition of "of God", or "of the Father", or "my", or "of Christ" Himself, or "of the Son", or "from me" (i.e. "from God"), or with the article, so that He is called not simply "spirit" but "the Spirit", or the very term "Holy Spirit", or "Paraclete", or "of Truth" (i.e. of the Son who says "I am the Truth")—that, just because you have heard the word "spirit", you take it to be the Holy Spirit? . . . To sum up, unless the article is present or the above-mentioned addition, it cannot refer to the Holy Spirit.¹

Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture, the teaching of the part in the light of the general drift of the teaching of the whole, and the language of any particular verse in the light of the custom of Scripture's language.

(iv) Another principle connected with the scope and custom of Scripture is the appeal to *the sense of Scripture* (διάνοια). Discussing Proverbs viii. 22, Athanasius argues that Scripture says that the Son or the Logos is created only when it refers to a purpose, namely the salvation of men, i.e. in relation to the Incarnation. "The works" for which the Son (= Logos = Wisdom) was created (= became incarnate) were "to give a witness . . . and for our sakes to undergo death, to raise man up and to destroy the works of the devil". He goes on to enumerate passages from the New Testament which demonstrate the soteriological purpose of the Incarnation, and continues:

Not for Himself, then, but for our salvation, and to abolish death, and to condemn sin, and to give sight to the blind, and to raise up all from the dead, has He come; but if not for Himself, but for us, consequently it is not for Himself, but for us, that He is created. But if it is not for Himself, but for us, that He is created, then He is not a creature Himself, but He uses such language as having put on our flesh. And that this is the sense of the Scriptures (ταύτην τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχουσιν αἱ γραφαί), we may learn from the Apostle, who says in Ephesians (ii. 14 f.), "Having broken down the middle wall of partition between

¹ Ep. ad Serap. i. 4 (PG. xxvi. 536 f.).

us, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, to create in Himself of the two one new man, so making peace ".¹

"The sense of Scripture", then, is but another name for "the custom of Scripture".

(v) There is also one passage where Athanasius appeals to *the style of Scripture*, a principle which is another variation of the appeal to the custom of Scripture. Athanasius points out that Scripture often speaks of sons as servants without denying their true nature as sons; so too Scripture speaks of the Son as created without denying His true nature as Son. He says:

Perhaps they grant that the word "servant" (Phil. ii. 6) is used under a certain understanding, but lay stress upon "who made" (Heb. iii. 2) as a great support for their heresy. But this prop of theirs is but a broken reed; for if they are aware of the style of Scripture, they must at once give sentence against themselves.²

All of these principles of exegesis may be subsumed under the general principle that Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture, the part by the whole, the lesser known by the better known.

(vi) Finally, Athanasius emphasizes the necessity of paying attention to *the context of Scripture*. Issuing a warning against taking proverbial sayings literally, Athanasius says that "we must not expound them nakedly in their first sense, but we must inquire into the person, and thus religiously put the sense on it";³ that is, attention must be given to the context. This principle becomes clear in the following passages:

Now it is right and necessary, as in all divine Scripture, so here (Heb. i. 4), faithfully to expound the time of which the Apostle wrote, and the person (*πρόσωπον*), and the point, lest the reader, missing either of these or any similar particular, may be wide of the true meaning. . . . When one has a proper understanding of these points, his comprehension of the faith is right and healthy; but if he mistakes any such points, forthwith he falls into heresy.⁴

A little later, having pointed out the kind of error that can creep in if we do not attend to the context, he says:

Such has been the state of mind under which Christ's enemies have fallen into their execrable heresy. For had they known the person and the subject

¹ *Or. c. Ar.* ii. 55 (PG. xxvi. 261 f.).

² *Ibid.* ii. 4 (PG. xxvi. 153).

³ *Ibid.* ii. 44 (PG. xxvi. 240).

⁴ *Ibid.* i. 54 (PG. xxvi. 124 f.).

and the season of the Apostle's words (Heb. i. 4), they would not have expounded of Christ's divinity what belongs to His humanity, nor in their folly committed so great an act of irreligion.¹

Discussing Proverbs viii. 22 as referring to the Incarnate Lord, he writes :

Any one may find this sense duly given in the divine oracles, who, instead of accounting the study of them a secondary matter, investigates the time and characters and the object, and thus studies and ponders what he reads.²

Again, discussing Hebrew iii. 2, having argued from the scope of Scripture, he says :

Since the meaning (*διάνοια*) of the context is orthodox, showing the time and the relation to which this expression points, I ought to show from it also how the heretics lack reason ; namely by considering, as we have done above, the occasion when it was used and for what purpose.³

These passages need no explanation. Athanasius asserts quite plainly that a right interpretation of any passage of Scripture must take into account the context of the passage.

IV

By laying down these principles of exegesis and by using them with care in his criticism of the selective exegesis of the Arians, Athanasius was able to expose the unscriptural nature of Arian doctrine. Parallel with his criticism of the heretics is his own development of the orthodox doctrine of the Son (and of the Holy Spirit), a doctrine which is based firmly on a sound interpretation of Scripture.

In his first letter to Serapion, Athanasius compares the interpreter of Scripture with a good banker counting his money :

Let us look one by one at the references to the Holy Spirit in the divine Scripture, and, like good bankers, let us judge whether he has anything in common with the creatures, or whether He pertains to God.⁴

That is Athanasius's own method, and it proved effective in the defence of the Biblical doctrine of the Son and the Holy Spirit against the speculations of the Arians and the Tropici which they supported by a selective exegesis of Scripture.

Using a different metaphor, at the beginning of his *Orations against the Arians* he says :

¹ *Or. c. Ar. i. 55* (PG. xxvi. 125).

³ *Or. c. Ar. ii. 7* (PG. xxvi. 161).

² *de Decr. 14* (PG. xxv. 440).

⁴ *Ep. ad Serap. i. 21* (PG. xxvi. 581).

For behold, we take divine Scripture, and thence discourse with the freedom of religious faith, and set it up as a light upon its candlestick.¹

That is true, not only of the exegesis of Scripture for the formulation of doctrine, but also for the devotional life of the Christian—a fact that is never absent from Athanasius's mind even in the heat of controversy. Towards the end of his life, in his Festal Letter for 367,² having given a list of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, he says :

These are the foundations of salvation, that they who thirst may be satisfied with the living words they contain. In these alone is proclaimed the doctrine of godliness.

It was in order to preserve the doctrine of godliness, to ensure that the fountains of salvation should not be choked with false interpretations, that Athanasius fought for so long, often almost alone. For he knew that mankind needed a Saviour who was truly divine as well as truly human, and that the Arian Christ, "the incarnation of what is not God in what is not man"³, was useless for the salvation of mankind and for raising men up in godliness.

Against the Arian doctrine supported by a selective exegesis of the Bible, Athanasius sets forth a Biblical theology which is firmly based on Scripture and derived from an interpretation of Scripture according to clearly formulated principles which, in their broad outlines, are as valid today as they were when he used them against the Arians.

¹ *Or. c. Ar. i. 9* (PG. xxvi. 28).

² *Ep. xxxix* (PG. xxvi. 1437).

³ W. P. DuBose, *The Ecumenical Councils*, p. 90.

THE ARABIC CHESS MANUSCRIPTS IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

By JOSEPH DE SOMOGYI, PH.D., D.Sc.

CONSIDERING the great importance of medieval Muslim Chess in the history of the game, the two Arabic chess manuscripts of the John Rylands Library deserve our full attention. They have been summarily reviewed three times : first, by N. Bland in his article " On the Persian Game of Chess " in *J.R.A.S.* (1852), pp. 27-31 ; then by H. J. R. Murray in his monumental work *A History of Chess* (Oxford, 1913), pp. 175-7 ;¹ and lastly by A. Mingana in the *Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester, 1934), nos. 766 and 767, cols. 1015-20. However, a detailed analysis of them in the light of modern research is highly important for two reasons. First, as works of the post-classical period of Arabic literature they, summarizing the previous literature of chess, testify to the great significance of the game as a constituent of the *adab* in Arabic literature and Arab social life alike. Secondly, they contribute not a little to our knowledge of the Muslim practical game.

I

Ryl. Arabic MS. 766 : " Kitāb an-nuzhat fi'sh-shaṭranj " by Abū Zakariyā Yaḥyā ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥakīm.

The original title of the manuscript is somewhat longer, " Nuzhat arbāb al-'uqūl fi'sh-shaṭranj al-manqūl " (" Delight of the Intelligent in the Known (Game of) Chess "). Yet, as a note on the obverse of 1f, 2a, 1 assigned to the work the title " Kitāb an-nuzhatfi'sh-shaṭranj " (" The Book of the Delight of Chess "), we may, for the sake of brevity, accept this shorter title for the work.

¹ As James Robson pointed out in his paper " A Chess *Maqāma* in the John Rylands Library ", *BULLETIN*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (September, 1953), p. 111, n. 4, the catalogue numbers were changed by mistake in Murray's work.

Concerning the date of its composition, Mingana¹ points out that the *terminus a quo* is 817/1414, the year of death of al-Fīrūzābādī, whose “Qāmūs” is quoted on fol. 4a, 1.16, whereas the *terminus ad quem* is fixed by the reference to it of Ibn abī Ḥajala,² who died in 776/1375. Therefore, the work was probably finished between 750 and 770 A.H., i.e. in the third quarter of the eighth/fourteenth century.

The Excellence of the Game

After the author's name, Abū Zakariyā Yaḥyā ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥakīm (2b, 3), it is stated (ibid. 12-13) that his work on chess was compiled from different books. After praising the qualities inherent in the game, the author states that it had already been played by Alexander the Great (3a, 12), and quotes Qur'ān 18:83. When Sulaymān—the Biblical Solomon—lamented the loss of his son, he consoled himself with chess-playing (3b, 11. 3-4). According to the Greek scholars, Aristotle was the first man to play chess (4a, 2). After quoting a verse of Abū Nuwās (4a, 3-6), he states that, according to the “Kitāb fi'sh-shaṭranj” of al-Jāḥiẓ (4a, 12), Adam was the first man to play chess in order to console himself for the loss of his son. All these legendary statements are adduced to prove the excellence of chess.

The Derivation of the Word *shaṭranj*

The Arabic word *shaṭranj*, a derivation from Sanskrit *chatur anga* (“the four members of the army”),³ has several popular derivations in Arabic, three of which are being quoted by our author. Both al-Ghazālī in his “Durrat al-ghawwāṣ” (4a, 12) and al-Fīrūzābādī in his “Qāmūs” (4a, 16) derive it from *mushāṭara*, “halving”, the first also stating that the word *shaṭranj* has the measure *jardahl*, “a large camel”.⁴ Two other opinions derive the word from Persian, one from *sha-sh ranj*, “six colours”, i.e. the six kinds of chessmen, and the other

¹ Loc. cit.

² See under II.

³ For explanation see my paper “Muslim Table Games” in *The Islamic Quarterly*, iii, no. 4 (London, 1957), 241, n. 3.

⁴ But Ibn abī Ḥajala (see under II) and ad-Damīrī (cf. my paper, p. 240) prefer the spelling *shiṭranj*.

from *hasht ranj*, "eight colours" for the 8 times 8 squares of the chessboard (4b, 1-6).¹

The Invention of the Game

In the Muslim legend the invention of chess is closely interwoven with that of backgammon. Our author too states that whereas the Persians boasted of their king Ardashīr ibn Bābak having invented backgammon (*nard*), also called *nardashīr* after him, and having devised it so as to symbolize the world and its people (4b, 7-5a, 7), the inventor of chess was the Indian prince Śiṣṣa, who invented it for King Balhīt of India; the scholars of that age held chess as superior to backgammon (5a, 7-10). In this connection the author also relates the well-known story of why it was impossible to reward the inventor (5a, 10-5b, 4). Here, the statement of Ibn Khallikān is quoted for the size of this sum which, even if counted in grain, would be impossible to be paid (5b, 5-6a, 5). Although the author does not mention his source for this narrative, it is a wellnigh literal excerpt, except for Ibn Khallikān's statement, from ad-Damīrī's treatise on chess and backgammon.²

However, in addition to this best-known and generally adopted theory, there are also other opinions about the invention of chess. According to them, chess was invented to console a queen for the loss of her son in war (6a, 5-8); or, it was invented for a king who wanted a game similar to war (6a, 8-13). The two famous chess-writers aṣ-Ṣūlī and al-'Adlī are quoted concerning the Greek and Byzantine views on the invention of the game (6a, 13-16). The Persians, especially Khusrau, played it frequently (6a, 16-6b, 1).

The Best Time to Play Chess

Galen likened chess to fever and considered it as the best pastime for leisured people. One of his confidants earned a fortune and bought an estate by his skill in chess; chess is indeed the most agreeable *adab* and way of earning (6b, 2-6). Hippocrates recommended the game for the purpose of healing

¹ For other fanciful explanations, cf. my paper, pp. 240-1, n. 3.

² See my paper, pp. 238-40.

diarrhœa (6b, 7-13). Aḥmad al-Ḥarbānī stated that Yuḥannā ibn Māsawayh ordered chess to be played at the time of ar-Rashīd when pestilence was raging. Not all the seasons were proper for playing it, especially not spring (6b, 14-7a, 11). According to the Indian books, rainy weather is the best time for playing it (7a, 12-3). Abū Nuwās also recommended chess-playing and wine-bibbing as the best pastimes in rainy weather (7a, 14-7b, 4).

Chess was considered as a game for kings and notables, not for the common people (7b, 5-9). Mahrārīs, when asked by his pupils, gave the medical opinion that chess is "non-essential and hot", otherwise it would not cause joy and dispel cares (7b, 9-12). There then follows the enumeration of various appreciative opinions on the game (7b, 13-14b, 15) by Barzūya, Ibn 'Abbās, al-Ma'mūn, Hārūn ar-Rashīd, al-Akhṭal, Ardashīr, Shabīb ibn Shubba, Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥaḍīb, Abū Nuwās, Di'bul ibn 'Alī, Abū 'Isā, 'Abdalmalik ibn Marwān, ash-Sha'bī, Jarīr, Abū 'Abdarrahmān al-Baghdādī, al-Māwardī, aṣ-Ṣūlī, Abū 'Uthmān, Abū 'ṣ-Ṣilt, 'Ubādat al-Miḥnath, 'Abdallāh ibn Mas'ūd, Abū Yūsuf, Yaḥyā ibn Bukayr, 'Ikrima, Ṣālīḥ ibn Ḥassān, az-Zubayr, ad-Dauraqī, Muḥammad ibn as-Sābiya al-Kalbī.

The Legal Aspects of the Game

On the much-discussed problem of the licitness or illicitness of the game, ad-Damīrī is quoted (14b, 17) as an authority on the legal aspects of chess. Indeed, the whole subchapter entitled *ishāra*, "reference" from the article '*aqrab*', "scorpion" in his "*Kitāb ḥayāt al-ḥayawān*" ("Book of the Lives of Animals"), is copied literally¹ (14b, 18-16a, 7).

The Etiquette of the Play

Much attention was paid in Muslim chess literature to the proper behaviour of the players towards each other. The author, with reference to a "*Kitāb al-futuwwa*", gives advice as to how a confidant should behave towards a partner superior in rank (16a, 7-16b, 3).² This is followed by a few general hints as

¹ See the subchapter "The Licitness of the Game" in my paper, pp. 241-3.

² Cf. Murray, op. cit. p. 233.

to how to play the game (16b, 3-17b, 19), on the authority of Abū Bakr aṣ-Ṣūlī, ar-Rāzī, al-ʿAdlī, Abul-Aswad ad-Duʿalī, ad-Dardāʿu, al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, and Abū Dāʿud.

The Ranks of the Players

According to their skill, the chessplayers are divided into six classes (*ṭabaqāt*). The highest class is the *ʿāliya*, "grandees", comprising very few names in each generation; the most famous were Rabrab, Jābir, Abu'n-Naʿām (in the text, Abu-n-Naʿāyim), al-ʿAdlī, and ar-Rāzī. Next come the *mutaqāribāt*, "proximes", who receive the odds of a Pawn from the grandees. The third class comprises the players who receive the odds of a Queen from the grandees. The players of the fourth class receive a Knight, those of the fifth class a Rook as odds, while those of the sixth class receive odds greater than the Queen and less than the Knight (17b, 19-18a, 7).¹

The Values of the Chessmen

Our author gives the values of the chessmen in exactly the same manner as the other authorities do (18a, 7-18).² He similarly quotes the opinions of al-ʿAdlī and ar-Rāzī about the considerable changes these values undergo in the end-games (*dusūt*, 18a, 18-19a, 17).

The Varieties of the Game

With reference to al-ʿAdlī, our author also enumerates and gives diagrams of the different varieties of the game which were usual in his time. Of these he describes (1) *ash-shaṭranj al-murabbaʿ*, "the Square Chess", the ordinary type of the game, played on a board of 64 squares with twice 16 chessmen; (2) *ash-shaṭranj at-tāmma*, "the Complete Chess", played on a board of 100 squares with twice 20 chessmen, the additional pieces on both sides being 2 *dabbābas* (one standing between the King and the Bishop and the other between the Queen and the Bishop) and 2 Pawns in front of them: a diagram (19a) showing the ground position of the chessmen; (3) *ash-shaṭranj ar-rūmiyya*, "the Byzantine Chess", played on a circular board of 4 times 16

¹ Cf. Murray, op. cit. pp. 231-2.

² Ibid. pp. 227-8.

squares in concentric circles with twice 16 chessmen, of which the Pawns cannot queen (19a, 17-20a to the end).¹

A Collection of End-game Positions

Then there follow seventy-three diagrams with marginal analyses, showing various positions (20b, 1-40a, 5). Most of them are taken from the books of aṣ-Ṣūlī and al-ʿAdlī. Seventy diagrams show end-game positions (*manṣūbāt*), which were the prototypes of the modern chess problem, and three showing Knight's Tours, for the solution of the second of which Ibn al-Manī'a's poem is quoted (39a).

An Anthology of Chess Poems

Next the manuscript contains a section entitled "Bāb az-zahr", "A Collection of Flowers".² It is an anthology of poems on the game of chess (40a, 5-50a, 19). The poets, named or anonymous, and the verses quoted are as follows :

Abū Zayd ibn al-ʿĀmma, the Andalusian poet (40a, 6-7),
al-Ḥasan ibn Abi'n-Najl (mentioned in al-Mas'ūdī's work,
40a, 10-11),

Ibn ar-Rūmī, *qaṣīda* (40a, 16),
the *Kitāb al-ghasaq* (by ʿAsālān al-Miṣrī, 40b, 1),

Maḥmūd ibn al-Ḥasan (40b, 8),
an anonymous poet (40b, 13),

Abū Nuwās (40b, 18 ; 41a, 11 ; 73 b, 8),

Abū ʿAmr ar-Ramādī, *qaṣīda* in praise of the vizier ʿAbdar-
raḥmān ibn al-Mubashshir (41a, 18-19),

another *qaṣīda* (41b, 17),

Ibn Waqīʿ at-Tamīmī (42b, 7, 23),

ʿAṣālān al-Miṣrī (42b, 19),

Kuthayyir ʿAzza (44a, 18),

an anonymous Damascene poet (44b, 18),

a poet from Ḥijāz, perhaps identical with al-Khālīd al-Qannās
(45a, 9),

¹ Cf. Murray, op. cit. p. 276 and, for the diagrams and their solutions, pp. 282-338, especially p. 318, subchapter III.

² My reading for *Bāb azhar* in the text.

“ a man from among the physicians descended from Sind ”
(46a, 1),

an anonymous poet (49a, 6),

Zīrīn al-Ma‘rūfī (49a, 11),

al-Faqīh Muḥammad’s poem from the *Kitāb al-ḥadiqa*,
supposed to be the work of ‘Abdallāh ibn Sharaf al-Qayra-
wānī (50a, 15),

Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad al-Miṣrī (50a, 19).

An Enumeration of the Odds

A separate section (50b, 1-51a, 8) is devoted to the proper gradation (*kḥaṭṭ*) of the odds (*kḥarjāt*) given by a player to his inferior opponent.¹ A list of excellent players follows (51a, 8-16) on the authority of Abul-‘Abbās ibn Jurayj.

An Addition to the Treatise on the Game

The work ends with a chapter entitled “Ḥawāshī al-kalām ‘an al-la‘b ” (“ Additions to the Treatise on the Game ”), containing verses for tricks on the chessboard (51b, 1-54b, 18). For poets are quoted Abul-Bazzār (52a, 15), Abul-Faḍl at-Tamīmī (52a, 19), Ibn Sūrūn (52b, 7), ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl az-Zamzamī al-Makkī (54a, 20). The appendix includes a table of computing the number of grains the inventor of the game wanted for himself in reward for his invention (53a-b).

II

Ryl. Arabic MS. 767 : “ Anmūdḥaj al-qitāl fī naql al-‘iwāl ”
by Ibn abī Ḥajala.

This is the original title of the work (“ Example of Warfare ² in the Movement of Chess-contenders ”) but it is more commonly quoted as “ Anmūdḥaj al-qitāl fī la‘b ash-shaṭranj ” (“ Examples of Warfare in the Game of Chess ”).³ Its author, Ibn abī Ḥajala, died in 776/1375 ; therefore, he was a contemporary of Ibrāhīm al-Ḥakīm, the author of Ryl. Arabic MS. 766.

The work consists of an Introduction, 8 chapters, and a Conclusion. The number of the chapters is designed to conform to the number of the rows of squares as well as the number of the

¹ Cf. Murray, op. cit. pp. 232-3.

² N. Bland, op. cit. p. 28, aptly put it in Latin, “ Exemplum rei militariae ”.

³ Thus in Murray, op. cit. p. 176.

squares in each row, so that "each *bayt* could have its *bāb*" (5a, 6-9). This is a pun on the double meaning of both the Arabic words, *bayt* meaning "house" and "square (of chessboard)", and *bāb* meaning "door, gate" and "chapter".

After the eulogy and preface (3b, 1-6b, 10), the Introduction (6b, 10-14b, 13) deals with (1) the stories of early Muslim players, (2) the problem of the licitness of the game, and (3) the correct spelling of the word *shaṭranj* (6b, 10-15). The only *imām* not to forbid chess was ash-Shāfi'ī (6b, 15-7a, 6). Al-Bayhaqī in the "Kitāb ash-shādhāt" of his "Sunan" mentions that Sa'īd ibn Jubayr played chess with his back turned on the board (7a, 6-12). According to ash-Shāfi'ī, Ibn Sīrīn and Hishām ibn 'Urwa also used to play chess without seeing the board (7a, 12-14). Ash-Shāfi'ī himself was a chessplayer who, according to the work of Abū 'Abdallāh Muḥammad ibn Shākir al-Qatān, also preferred to play with his back turned on the board (7a, 15-7b, 2). Al-Māwardī in his "Ḥāwī" alluded to the licitness of chess since it was not forbidden by either 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb or Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī. Abū Hurayra even played it with one of his pages (7b, 2-11). 'Abdallāh ibn 'Abbās and 'Abdallāh ibn Zubayr, also Companions of the Prophet, were also chessplayers (7b, 11-15). From among the Followers of the Prophet, Sa'īd ibn al-Musayyab, Sa'īd ibn Jubayr, Ibn al-Ḥusayn, ash-Sha'bī, and Ibn Sīrīn are named as chessplayers by al-Māwardī in his "Ḥāwī" (7b, 15-8a, 14).¹ The author of "Al-bayān" refers to chess being called a game of war. When once 'Ā'isha, together with the Prophet Muḥammad, passed by a group of Ethiopians throwing lances, Muḥammad stopped and observed the sport from behind (8a, 14-8b, 6). This tradition is not out of place here; it is quoted as a proof of the Prophet's liking for warlike games—consequently, he would not have disapproved of chess, had it been known to him.

As to the much-contended problem of the licitness of chess, the commentator of the "Mashāriq al-anwār" considered the game as licit on three conditions: (1) it should not be played for gambling or a stake, (2) the player should not neglect his prayers or other religious duties, (3) no improper language at play ought

¹ Cf. Murray, op. cit. pp. 191-2.

to be used—such was the opinion of the Companions as well (8b, 6-15). Already the followers of ash-Shāfi'ī added a fourth condition also, that it should not be played in the street or public places (8b, 15-9a, 3).¹ However, the other three *imāms* were not so liberal as ash-Shāfi'ī was. Abū Ḥanīfa considered chess as disapproved (*makrūh*), whereas Mālik ibn Anas and Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal forbade it as illicit (*ḥarām*)² (9a, 3-9), which was also the opinion of al-Māwardī (9a, 9-9b, 9). The canon law problem of licitness allows of an interesting comparison between chess and backgammon. According to Ibn Taymiyya (9b, 9-11a, 4), backgammon and similar gambling games, like *maysir* and *qumar*, were considered as absolutely illicit by all the four *imāms*, except for a few Shāfi'ites who permitted the game of backgammon. On the contrary, Mālik ibn Anas regarded chess as worse than backgammon because it detracts man's mind from the prayer more than backgammon does; but the other three *imāms* regarded chess as better than backgammon. Such liberal Shāfi'ites as permitted backgammon, set up the condition that it is not played for a stake.³ Al-Ghazālī's opinion was the same (11b, 13-12a, 4).⁴

As to the origin of the word *shaṭranj* (12a, 4-14b, 13), al-Jawālīqī in his "Kitāb al-Mu'arrab" (12a, 6) regarded it as a word of Persian origin. Some authorities, like al-Ḥarīrī in his "Durrat al-ghawwāṣ" (12a, 8), spell it with an *i* but the majority spell it with an *a*. There is also a divergence of opinions as to the spelling of the initial consonant of the word. Ṣalāḥaddīn aṣ-Ṣafadī (12a, 14) and others pronounce it with an *s* instead of an *sh*. As Jamāladdīn ibn Mālik (12b, 6-7) puts it, both spellings occur, *s* and *sh* as well as *i* and *a*. Aṣ-Ṣafadī (12b, 10) accepted *s* as more correct, the word being derived from the verb *saṭara*, and the infinitive of its 2nd stem, *taṣṭīr* meaning "dividing up the chessboard into squares by straight lines"; but this is an error because the word is Persian. The spelling *sa* was accepted by al-Ḥarīrī in his "Durrat al-ghawwāṣ" (13a, 5, 12), Ibn as-Sikkīt in his "Iṣlāḥ al-manṭiq" (13b, 12), and Sībawayh (13b, 8),

¹ Cf. Murray, op. cit. pp. 189-90.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid. p. 188-9.

⁴ Cf. ad-Damīrī's more detailed discussion of the subject; see my paper pp. 242.

whereas the spelling *si* is advocated by Ibn Barrī (13a, 4 ; 13b, 5). Also al-Baṭalyūsī in his “Sharḥ Adab al-kātib” (13b, 13-14) quotes Ibn al-Jinnī in favour of the spelling *si*, in order to make it conform to the metre of the word *jirdaḥl*, “a large camel”. The pertinent opinions of Ibn Hishām al-Ḥaḍrāwī in his “Sharḥ al-īḍāḥ” (14a, 6) and the poet Ibn al-Labbāna (14a, 14) are also quoted. According to Sībawayh (14a, 9) there is an analogy with spelling *firzān*, “Queen (in chess)”, with an *a*. Other derivations of the word *shaṭranj* are from Persian *shash rank*, “six colours” denoting the six kinds of chessmen (14b, 8) or from Persian *shad ranj*, “the passing of cares” (14b, 13).

All the eight chapters end with a small collection of five diagrams showing (1) an opening, (2) a game won by White, (3) a game won by Black, (4) an easy draw, (5) a hard draw.¹

I. The first chapter (14b, 14-26a, 4) deals with *the invention of the game*. Four stories are related on it. The first story is narrated on the authority of Zamakhsharī² (15a, 3-15b, 8). A certain king of India of peaceful intentions procured the invention of chess in order that his fellow-monarchs might settle their disputes over the board without effusion of blood. According to the second story (15b, 9-16a, 1),³ it was invented for a certain king for the purpose of giving him the opportunity to learn military tactics. The invention was due to a certain sage⁴ who also taught the king fourteen *ta'biyāt*, “openings”. The third story (16a, 1-16b, 6) connects the invention of chess with that of backgammon. The latter game (*nard*) was invented by King Ardashīr ibn Bābak of Persia, for which reason he was also called Nardashīr.⁵ After detailing the symbolism inherent in backgammon⁶ and referring to Ibn Taymiyya's statement (16a, 15) that backgammon was better than chess, the story continues. When the Persians boasted of backgammon, the King of India commanded Ṣiṣṣa ibn Dāhir to invent a game superior to that ; thus chess was invented. The fourth—erroneously quoted as the fifth—story (16b, 6-18b, 15) attributes the invention of chess

¹ Cf. Murray, op. cit. p. 279.

² Ibid. p. 212 where erroneously b, Makhsharī is given instead of az-Zamakhsharī.

³ Ibid. p. 212.

⁴ His name was Ṣiṣṣa, or according to others, Ṣaṣṣa, ibn Dāhir.

⁵ Ibid. p. 208-10.

⁶ See my paper, pp. 239-40.

to the order of a king of India that, the Persians having invented backgammon, a game symbolizing the world, a game of war should in return be invented by the Indians, symbolizing the operations of two armies on a board.¹ Then (18b, 15-22b, 10) it is related how the inventor was rewarded, with reference to Ibn Taymiyya (18a, 14). There are five systems of computing the total sum of grains : one according to Ibn Khallikān (19a, 3)² in grain, two according to the " Kitāb muḥāḍarāt al-udabā wa muḥāḍarāt al-bulaghā " of Abul-Mufākhīr Muḥammad al-Iṣfahānī (20a, 5) in *dirhams*, the fourth according to Quṭbaddūn ibn 'Abdalqādir in his " Risāla ad-durrat al-mādiya " ³ (21b, 2) in years, and the fifth according to al-Akfānī (22a, 1) in distances of miles.

The first of the collection of diagrams (22b, 11-26a, 4) is the opening called *muraddad*. It appears from a reference (23b, 10) that aṣ-Ṣūlī's work was used.

II. The second chapter (26a, 5-31a, 5) contains *the classification* of the chessplayers.⁴ Five or six classes are enumerated on the authority of al-'Adlī (26b, 10) and aṣ-Ṣūlī (26b, 11) ; (1) the 'āliya, " the grandees ", whose number never surpasses three at any time ; (2) the *mutaqāribāt*, " proximes ", who have won two to four games in ten, when playing with a grandee from whom they receive odds, mainly the QKtP or the RP ; (3) those who receive the odds of the Queen from the grandees ; (4) that of the Knight, (5) that of the Rook, (6) odds greater than the Queen but less than the Knight. Al-'Adlī said : " He who can play *shāh rukh* or *shāh māt* cannot receive the odds of the Knight " (26b, 10) Aṣ-Ṣūlī is also referred to as the authority on the relative values of the chessmen as calculated for their original positions (26b, 15-27a, 15).⁵ Finally, the classification of the chessmen with special stress on their symbolism (27b, 13-28b, 5) is dealt with, on the authority of 'Abdalmalik az-Zayyāt (28a, 1) and another author (28a, 10).⁶

¹ See the literal translation of the passage in Murray, op. cit. p. 222.

² Cf. Murray, op. cit. pp. 217-18.

³ Not " Durrat ul Muziyah " as quoted by N. Bland, op. cit. p. 30.

⁴ Cf. Murray, op. cit. pp. 231-2.

⁵ Ibid. p. 227, in literal translation.

⁶ Ibid. pp. 221-2, in literal translation.

The first of the collection of diagrams (28b, 6-31a, 5) is the opening called *hiṣā Fir'aun*, "the Pharaoh's pebbles".

III. The third chapter (31a, 5-41b, 4) contains a long extract from aṣ-Ṣūlī (31a, 6) giving *maxims and advice* to the chessplayers, with the critical commentary of our author. Advice is given as to (1) how to post the King (31a, 11-32a, 6), (2) how to play with the Pawns (32a, 6-33a, 14), (3) the best position of the chessmen (33a, 14-34b, 9). Finally, our author, referring to his own work entitled "Kitāb sukkardān as-sultān" (36a, 14), relates several stories connected with chess.

The first of the collection of diagrams (39a, 10-41b, 4) is the opening called *mashā'ikh*.

IV. The fourth chapter ¹ (41b, 4-46b, 7) treats of the chessplayers' *adab* and the most suitable *time* of the game. A chess-player should be carefree, well-groomed, of good memory and manners, who must not play when he is troubled by anything. He should not play with a person superior in rank to him. Ibn Māawayh (42a, 10) adds that his speech should be elegant, he ought to be quick at answer and a truth-teller. Other physicians hold the rainy season as the most suitable for the game. Likewise, Saturday is the most appropriate day and autumn the most suitable season for playing chess. The "four temperaments" which, on Greek examples, played so prominent a part in Arab medicine also, were symbolized by the King, the Queen, the Bishop, and the Rook. Hippocrates (42b, 13) said that chess can cure illnesses for which there were no other remedies. Galen (42b, 15) related that Hippocrates had cured a certain king from his absence of mind by playing chess before him. Galen (43a, 13) himself recommended chess as the best pastime for carefree people.

The first of the collection of diagrams (43b, 2-46b, 6) is, with reference to aṣ-Ṣūlī (43b, 9), the opening called *mu'aqrab*.²

V. The fifth chapter ³ (46b, 7-43a, 1) is on the *praise and blame of chess*. It is related that India has produced three excellent things in which she is superior to other lands: the game of chess,

¹ Wrongly quoted as Chapter V in Murray, op. cit. p. 176.

² Ibid. p. 239, n. 16.

³ Wrongly quoted as Chapter VI in Murray, op. cit. p. 176.

the book "Kalīla wa Dimna", and the nine arithmetic figures. Ibn Māsawayh (47a, 10) referred to chess as the necklace of wisdom. Alexander the Great was warmly recommended by his tutor to play chess as the best of comforters. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥakīm states in his "Kitāb al-manṣūbāt" (47b, 3) that a man can only be expert in the art of war if he has learned the game of chess. The anonymous work entitled *Al-fatāwā* (47b, 5) also states that there is wisdom, refinement, computation, and order in chess. Then there follow poetical quotations (47b, 15-51a, 6) on the same subject by the following poets :

Ibn al-Mu'tazz (47b, 15),

Muḥammad ibn Sharaf al-Qayrawānī (48a, 6 ; 48b, 7 ; 49b, 11),

an anonymous poet (48b, 12),

Abū 'Ubayda (48b, 14),

ash-Sha'bī (49a, 2),

ath-Tha'libī, "Kitāb yatīmat ad-dahr" (49a, 12).

The first of the collection of diagrams (51a, 6-54a, 2) is the opening called *mūshaḥ*, often played by aṣ-Ṣūlī (51a, 8-9).

VI. The sixth chapter ¹ (54a, 2-70a, 3) deals with *the varieties of chess*, and contains various *exercises and puzzles*.

Of the many varieties of the game our author mentions only three : (1) *ash-shaṭranj at-tāmma*, "the Complete Chess" of 80 (8 times 10) squares ² (54a, 7-54b, 8), on which the chessmen are arranged along the oblong sides, on rows 1, 3, 6, 8 ; (2) *ash-shaṭranj al-mamdūda*, "the Oblong Chess" of 64 (4 times 16) squares (54b, 8-9), on which the chessmen are arranged across the narrow ends of the board ; ³ (3) *ash-shaṭranj ar-rūmiyya*, "the Byzantine or Circular Chess" (54b, 9-12), which is only mentioned briefly.⁴

The collection of *mikḥrāqs* (plural : *makḥārīq* ⁵) contains quasi-mathematical problems or puzzles in the following groupings ; (1) the *mikḥrāq* of the two Rooks (55a, 1-55b, 2) ; ⁶ (2) the

¹ Wrongly quoted as Chapter VII by Murray, op. cit. p. 176.

² Ibid. pp. 341-2, but *ash-shaṭranj at-tāmma* is a wrong name, for it denotes the chessboard of 100 (10 time 10) squares.

³ Ibid. p. 340.

⁴ Ibid. p. 342-3.

⁵ Not *mikḥārīqs*, as mentioned by Murray, ibid. p. 335.

⁶ Ibid. p. 337, no. 565.

mikhrāq of the two Knights (55b, 2-7);¹ (3) the *mikhrāq* of seven Pawns (55b, 8-56a, 2);² (4) the *mikhrāq* of the eight Pawns and a Knight (56a, 2-5);³ (5) the *mikhrāq* of all the chessmen and a Knight (56a, 6-57a, 13):⁴ all the chessmen are arranged in one half of the board, and the problem is how to take all of them with a Knight posted on the right-hand Rook's square. A poem (57a, 2-13) is also quoted in praise of this *mikhrāq*; (6) the *mikhrāq* of the two Bishops (57a, 14-57b, 10);⁵ (7) the *mikhrāq* of the Rook (57b, 14-58a, 12);⁶ (8) aṣ-Ṣūlī's *mikhrāq* of the eight Pawns (58a, 13-58b, 12).⁷

A separate section (58b, 13-70a, 3) describes various tricks with chessmen. With reference to the "Ṣarḥ lāmi'at al-'ajam" of Ṣalāḥaddīn aṣ-Ṣafadī (59a, 1; 61b, 7) and a poem by Majdaddīn ibn Naṣrallāh (61b, 11; 62a, 3), first follow ten tricks with thirty chessmen arranged round the two Kings on a circular board (59b, 1-62b, 12), with ten diagrams. Then there follow four tricks, with four diagrams (63a, 1-65a, 3) with the thirty-two chessmen arranged in different groupings on the four edges of the board of 64 squares.

The enumeration of these tricks is preceded with a story related by aṣ-Ṣafadī (59a, 2-14). According to it, once a ship with Muslim and Christian passengers was in danger of sinking amidst the ocean. In order to save the ship, the casting out of some passengers was necessary. It was proposed to cast lots for this purpose: on whomsoever the lot would fall he would be cast into the sea. But the captain objected to the proposal and suggested instead that every ninth person should be cast into the sea, on which all agreed. The counting and the following execution resulted in all the Christians perishing and all the Muslims remaining alive. This is shown on Diagram 1 (59b).

The collection ends with a group of nine tricks (65a, 4-67b, 11) which are arithmetical puzzles not all connected with the game of chess, in the form of questions and answers.

The first of the five diagrams (67b, 12-70a, 3) is the opening

¹ Not *mikhāriq*, as mentioned by Murray, *ibid.* p. 337, no. 562.

² *Ibid.* p. 337, no. 563. ³ *Ibid.* p. 337, no. 560. ⁴ Not mentioned in Murray.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 338, no. 568, with a different arrangement of the chessmen.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 337, no. 567.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 337, no. 564.

called *watad al-'anz*, "goat-peg", so named by aṣ-Ṣūlī (67b, 15 ; 69a, 12).

VII. The seventh chapter (70a, 3-76b, 9) contains stories and anecdotes (*al-munāẓara wal-muḥāḍara*) in prose and verse. Aṣ-Ṣūlī (70a, 8), about whom ad-Dāraquṭnī and al-Marzubānī (both 70a, 11) reported, was the first authority on chess of his age, and the author of numerous works. Some people, thus Ibn Khallikān (70b, 2), attributed to him also the invention of the game, but this is an error, the inventor having been the Indian Ṣiṣṣa ibn Dāhir. Then, with reference to al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūj adh-dhahab* (70b, 5), aṣ-Ṣafadī (71a, 8 ; 71b, 15), and Shamsaddīn al-Munajjim ash-Shā'ir (72a, 6), eight anecdotes (ending on 74a, 13) are narrated.

The first of the five diagrams (74a, 12-76b, 9) is the opening *al-mutalāḥiq* taken from aṣ-Ṣūlī (74b, 5 ; 76a, 2).

VIII. The eighth chapter (76b, 9-81a, 11) contains *poetical quotations on chess* by the following poets :

al-Qāḍī al-Fāḍil (76b, 15 ; 77a, 6),

Ibn Qalānis (77a, 14),

Abul-Fadl at-Tamīmī (77a, 10),

Ibn al-Habbāriya (77b, 2),

Muḥammad ibn Sharaf al-Qayrawānī (77b, 7),

Nāṣiraddīn ibn an-Naqīb (77b, 11),

the author himself (78a, 3, 8, 13 ; 78b, 3).

The first of the five diagrams (78b, 7-81a, 11) is the opening *al-'ajā'iz*. (78b, 7-81a, 11).

The Conclusion (*kḥātima*) of the work is the Chess *maqāma*, (81a, 11-86b, 11) edited and translated by Professor J. Robson.¹

87a, 10-88b to the end contain a collection of cabbalistic and magic formulae, not connected with chess. They were evidently written by a later hand.

III

Ryl. Arabic MS. 791 : An Arabic Manuscript of Mixed Contents, Fols. 234-5.

¹ Op. cit. pp. 111-13 for the author, the literary form of the *maqāma*, and the manuscript ; pp. 114-21 for the translation, and pp. 122-7 for the text of the Chess *Maqāma*.

This digest of various manuscripts (see Mingana's "Catalogue", pp. 1103-4, D) contains the fragment of a chess manuscript under the title "Faṣl fī maḍū' ash-shaṭranj wa mā fīhi min al-ḥikam" ("A Section on the Subject of Chess and on Its Purport of Wisdom"). It consists of a long quotation from the poem "Urjūza sha'riyya". Its author is Ibn al-Habbāriya whose full name is Abū Ya'lā Muḥammad Ibn al-Habbāriya (died in 504/110).¹

The poem belongs to the category of the usual chess poetry praising the game. As it is a fragment, which was written, according to 235b, 13-14, in 1181/1767, it cannot be considered for its content without collating it with fuller and older manuscripts.

¹ Cf. Ch. Brockelmann, *GAL*, I, 252-3.

NEW SAYINGS OF JESUS IN THE RECENTLY DISCOVERED COPTIC "GOSPEL OF THOMAS"¹

BY WALTER C. TILL, DR. PHIL.

READER IN COPTIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER;
TIT. AO. PROFESSOR IN EGYPTOLOGY (VIENNA)

GNOSTICISM, which is approximately as old as Christianity, was, in the first centuries, a dangerous rival to the young Christian creed.² Therefore the Gnostics were persecuted and this was done so effectively that nearly all the Gnostic books were destroyed. The only available information about the ideas of the different Gnostic schools was, for a long time, only to be found in the contemporary books written against them.

The first Gnostic manuscript of which we have knowledge was brought from Egypt to London where it was bought, in the second half of the eighteenth century, by Dr. A. Askew, a London physician whose hobby was collecting manuscripts. After his death it was sold to the British Museum where it still remains.³ It is called the Codex Askewianus and its language is Coptic,⁴ as is that of the rest of the Gnostic manuscripts which have so far come to light.

About A.D. 1769 the famous Scottish traveller James Bruce bought a number of manuscripts in Egypt and among them was another Gnostic manuscript in Coptic, now called the Codex Brucianus. After his death it was sold to the Bodleian Library.⁵

Both these manuscripts have been edited and translated more

¹ This paper was read to the Manchester University Egyptian and Oriental Society on the 1st of December 1958. It has been altered in some places and notes have been added.

² The latest English book on Gnosticism is R. McL. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem*, London, 1958.

³ B.M. Add. MS. 5114 (parchment).

⁴ Cf. my article "Coptic and its Value", *BULLETIN*, xl (1957), 229-58.

⁵ Bruce MS. 96 (papyrus).

than once.¹ The texts in them are of a comparatively late period when Gnosticism was already near to its decay.²

In 1896 another Coptic manuscript with Gnostic texts was bought in Egypt for the Berlin Museum. A series of unfortunate events prevented its being edited until 1955.³ The second text of this manuscript, the "Apocryphon of John", is of considerable importance because it gives a full account of the system of the Gnostic school.⁴

In 1945 or 1946 some Egyptian farmers found a vessel containing thirteen papyrus manuscripts (books, not rolls)⁵ with nearly fifty Gnostic texts in the Coptic language. These manuscripts were found near the ancient Chenoboskion, not far from the modern village Naga Hammâdi in Upper Egypt. They formed the library of a Gnostic community which lived in Upper Egypt in the fourth or fifth century. We may suppose that it was persecution which led to the library being hidden. In view of the fact that these manuscripts are more than fifteen centuries old and are written on extremely brittle material, they are in very good condition. Most of them were in their original leather bindings.⁶

¹ The latest translation is Carl Schmidt, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften, erster Band: Die Pistis Sophia, die beiden Bücher des Jeû, unbekanntes altgnostisches Werk*. 2. Auflage: *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*, Band 45 (13), Berlin, 1954. There is a full account of the literature in the introduction to this book. The latest English translation of the Codex Askewianus (= Pistis Sophia) is George Horner, *Pistis Sophia. Literally translated from the Coptic. With an introduction by F. Legge* (S.P.C.K., London, 1924). The latest English edition (with translation) of a part of the Codex Brucianus is Ch. A. Baynes, *A Coptic Gnostic treatise contained in the Codex Brucianus*, Cambridge, 1933.

² Cf. W. Till, *Die Gnosis in Ägypten. La parola del passato* 12 (N: ples 1949), pp. 231-50.

³ Walter C. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensi 8502. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 60. Band (= V. Reihe, Band 5), Berlin 1955.

⁴ Cf. Walter C. Till, "The Gnostic Apocryphon of John" in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, iii (London, 1952), 14-22.

⁵ Papyrus was produced in the shape of a long roll. But it was not always used in this form. Very often, especially in Coptic times, leaves were cut from the rolls and a book was made of them.

⁶ Jean Doresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d'Égypte*, Paris, 1958. One of the plates (between pp. 136 and 137) gives a very instructive picture of some of these manuscripts. The next plate shows the place where the manuscripts were found.

The importance of this Gnostic library is in fact not less than that of the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls. But a number of unfortunate circumstances have prevented the editing of these highly important texts. First of all, the manuscripts were not from the outset in the control of the Egyptian Antiquity Department but came into private hands. Only one manuscript was bought for the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo and that soon after the find. The rest remained in private possession and only after many years' negotiations was it possible to acquire them for the Coptic Museum—with one exception. One of the manuscripts was brought out of Egypt and, after a long journey through the Old and the New World, purchased privately and presented to the C. G. Jung-Institut in Zürich. It is called the Codex Jung in honour of the famous Swiss psychologist Carl Gustav Jung.¹ One of the four texts contained in it has been edited. It is called "the Gospel of the Truth" and was published in 1956 in Zürich under the Latin title "Evangelium veritatis".²

This text is the only one so far edited from the Gnostic library found near Naga Hammâdi. In 1956 an international committee was formed in Cairo in order to study and edit these important texts. It is to be hoped that no further difficulties will arise and that they will all be edited in due course.³

¹ Cf. F. L. Cross, *The Jung Codex*, London, 1955.

² Michel Malinine, Henry-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, *Evangelium veritatis. Studien aus dem C. G. Jung-Institut*, vi, Zürich, 1956. This *editio princeps* contains the Coptic text (with excellent plates of all the pages edited in the book), a French, a German, and an English translation. Cf. Walter C. Till, "Bemerkungen zur Erstausgabe des 'Evangelium veritatis'", *Orientalia*, N.S. xxvii (Rome, 1958), 269-86. The leaves with pp. 33-6 of the "Gospel of the Truth" (*Evangelium veritatis*) are not in Zürich but in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo. Photographic reproductions have been published by Dr. Pahor Labib in *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo*, vol. i (Cairo 1956), plates 5, 6, 9, and 10. I have prepared an edition of these four pages which will shortly be published in *Orientalia* (Rome) under the title "Die Kairener Seiten des Evangeliums der Wahrheit".

³ There is little hope that these texts will be published in rapid sequence unless the present idea that a detailed commentary ought to be given in the *editio princeps* is abandoned. I think that publishing first the texts with a short introduction, a translation and wordlists, and then giving the commentary later in a separate volume would yield much more satisfactory results.

One of them, "the Gospel of Thomas",¹ has received repeated mention in newspapers throughout the world. Like some other texts before it, it has been called "the Fifth Gospel". This is, to say the least, misleading. However it may be judged, there is no question that it cannot be added to the four canonical Gospels as an equal, which is apparently suggested by those who call it "the Fifth Gospel".

The "Gospel of Thomas" is a collection of sayings of Jesus which is not entirely unknown. In 1897 and 1903 a few Greek papyrus fragments were found at Oxyrhynchos (Egypt). The texts of these fragments are known as *Logia Jesu* and have been dealt with in many books and articles.² The "Gospel of Thomas" is the Coptic translation of the complete text of the Greek *Logia Jesu* but not exactly of the version we know from the fragments. The text of the Greek fragments must now be re-edited in accordance with the Coptic text. We know now how to fill the gaps.

In the "Gospel of Thomas" there are 114 logia according to the official edition.³ Not all are merely sayings of Jesus. There are, for instance, some short conversations between Jesus and other persons. They follow each other without any connection between them and obviously without any method. We find some of them repeated in the collection, the second time slightly altered. Sometimes we notice that one word, e.g. brother, children, woman, flesh, etc., is found in two logia following each other, the meaning of the two logia with the same word being quite different. If we regard the collection as a unit we

¹ There is another "Gospel of Thomas" dealing with the childhood of Christ. It has nothing in common with our text but the title. Cf. M. R. James, *The apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford, reprint 1955), pp. 14-16 and 49-70. In the following notes this book is referred to as "James".

² Cf. James, pp. 25-9. In the following notes these Oxyrhynchos Papyri are referred to as "Oxy" with the number.

³ It will be published under the Latin title *Evangelium secundum Thomam* by E. J. Brill, Leiden (Holland). The editors are Antoin Guillaumont, Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, Yassa Abdal-Masih, and myself. It is intended to publish it in an English, a French, and a German edition so that everyone may choose the language he understands best. It is hoped that the edition will be issued in the course of 1959.

find inconsistencies, which indicates clearly that the logia were taken from different sources.

The title of the text, as given at its beginning, is : " These are the secret sayings which the living Jesus said and Didymos Judas Thomas wrote down ".¹ The title at the end of the text is simply : " The Gospel according to Thomas ".²

Approximately half of the logia brought together in the " Gospel of Thomas " are known from the canonical Gospels. But they are always changed in some way—amplified, combined with something else, or, at least, differently worded. Therefore they are of importance and interest for the textual criticism of the New Testament.

As an example of the divergencies we may compare the parable of the Feast as it is told in the New Testament (Matt. xxii. 2-10 ; Luke xiv. 16-24) with logion 64 of the " Gospel of Thomas " which expresses the same ideas in quite a different way. It reads : " Jesus said : A man had guests and when he had prepared the meal, he sent his servant to summon the guests. He went to the first and said to him : My master summons thee. He said : Some traders owe me money ; they will come to me in the evening. I shall go and give them my orders. I pray to be excused from the feast. He went to another and said to him : My master has summoned thee. He said to him : I have bought a house and I am asked for an appointed day. I shall not be at leisure. He came to another and said to him : My master summons thee. He said to him : My friend is to marry and I am to give a feast. I shall not be able to come. I pray to be excused from the feast. He went to another and said to him : My master summons thee. He said to him : I have bought a village. I must go to collect the rent. I shall not be able to come. I pray to be excused. The servant came and said to his master : Those whom thou badest to the dinner have excused themselves. The master said to the servant : Go out into the

¹ Cf. Oxy 654 ; James, p. 26, Prologue.

² A German translation of the whole text has been edited by Johannes Leipoldt, " Ein neues Evangelium? Das koptische Thomasevangelium übersetzt und besprochen ", *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 83. Jahrgang (Leipzig 1958), pp. 481-96. Gérard Garitte in *Le Muséon*, lxx (Louvain, 1957), 62, states that he is preparing a Latin translation for Latin speaking peoples.

roads. Those whom thou shalt find, bring them, that they may dine. The buyers and merchants will not come into the places of my Father." This logion and some others are of interest from the point of view of folklore.

My task in the team of editors is to edit the Coptic text and to produce a proper translation. I must leave it to more competent scholars to go deeper into the question of the origin of the logia. Professors H.-Ch. Puech (Paris), G. Quispel (Utrecht), and Leipoldt (Leipzig) have already given their opinions in recently published articles.¹

Quispel thinks that the "Gospel of Thomas" was compiled in the second century, and not before 130 or 140. Leipoldt supposes that the collection was compiled during the fourth century, but that its sources go back into the second century.

Dating an early Coptic literary manuscript is extremely difficult because we have no dated manuscripts of these early times. Moreover, the scribes of books with biblical or related texts appear to imitate older manuscripts. Therefore to give an opinion regarding the date of an early Coptic manuscript cannot be, in the present state of our knowledge, much more than guess work. So we must not be surprised to find many diverging opinions regarding the time when the Coptic manuscript of the "Gospel of Thomas" was written. The extremes would appear to be the third century A.D., as some think, and about 500 (Leipoldt, loc. cit.). My own guess would be about 400.

The principal sources of the "Gospel of Thomas" were two apocryphal Gospels, "The Gospel according to the Egyptians" and "The Gospel according to the Hebrews", of which we already know some parts as quotations.²

In the "Gospel of Thomas" there are some logia completely unknown hitherto. Quispel thinks that those logia which are in the style of the canonical Gospels may be authentic sayings.

¹ H.-Ch. Puech, *L'Évangile selon Thomas. Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1957), pp. 146-66. G. Quispel, "Neu gefundene Worte Jesu," *Universitas*, xiii (Stuttgart, 1958), 359-66. J. Leipoldt in the article mentioned in the previous note.

² James, pp. 1-8 and 10-12 respectively. In the following notes the Gospel according to the Egyptians is indicated by G. Egy, the Gospel according to the Hebrews by G. Hebr.

But, of course, it is impossible to reach any certainty on the question of authenticity.

The Apostle Thomas himself is quite innocent and cannot be held responsible for "the Gospel of Thomas". It was a wide-spread practice in ancient times to attribute a book or a doctrine to some famous person in order to give it more authority.

Thomas plays a prominent rôle among the Apostles in our text. He is obviously considered as the most enlightened and advanced of the disciples. This is shown clearly in logion 13 : "Jesus said to his disciples : Tell me whom I am like. Simon Peter said to him : Thou art like a righteous angel. Matthew said to him : Thou art like a wise philosopher. Thomas said to him : Master, truly, my mouth will not bring itself to say to whom thou art like. Jesus said : I am not thy master, for thou hast drunk from the bubbling fountain and hast been inebriated. And he took him aside and told him three words. Now, when Thomas came to his companions, they asked him what Jesus had said to him. Thomas said to them : If I tell you one of the words he has told me you will take up stones and throw them at me and fire will come out of the stones and burn you up."

All the disciples and those who accept the doctrine taught by Jesus are a higher sort of men. I think we may suppose that they were considered to be those whom the Gnostics called *πνευματικοί*, the spirituals.¹

In logion 85 Jesus says : "Adam came forth from a great power and a great wealth and yet he was not worthy of you. For if he had been worthy he would not have tasted death". Logion 49 reads : "Jesus said : Blessed are the solitaires² and the elect, for you will find the kingdom because you come from it and you will return to it". By the change from the third person to the second it becomes obvious that Jesus is speaking to the solitaires.

¹ *πνευματικός* is a person whose *πνεῦμα* (spirit) is most fully developed, in contrast to the *ὕλικός*, the materialist (*ὕλη* = matter) and the *ψυχικός* whose soul (*ψυχή*) is predominant.

² "Solitary" translates here *μοναχός*, which cannot have its usual meaning "monk" in this early text, but seems rather to mean "the lonely one"—not so much in the sense of a hermit or an anchorite but of a person standing alone with the advanced development of his knowledge (gnosis) who, therefore, is not one of the mass.

The "Gospel of Thomas" does not contain any discussion of doctrine but the very choice of the logia gives us some idea of the views held by the compiler or redactor of this text.

It becomes obvious from the title, "The secret sayings", that the text was considered to be esoteric. We may even suppose that there were different degrees of esotericism, for in logion 13 already mentioned we see that Jesus took Thomas aside and told him three words which Thomas could not repeat to his fellow Apostles.

The very first logion of the collection suggests that there is a secret meaning in the sayings. It reads: "He who will find out the interpretation of these words will not taste death".¹ This, too, seems to me to point to a text of an esoteric character.

Another hint as to the esoteric character of the doctrine to which the Gospel of Thomas belonged might be seen in some logia stating that only very few will be able to reach the highest plane, e.g. logion 75 reads: "Jesus said: Many are standing at the door but the solitaries are they who will enter the bridal chamber".

For him who wants to be saved it is necessary above all to recognize the vanity of the material world. Logion 56 reads: "He who has known the world has found a corpse and then the world is not worthy of him". We even find this logion twice in the collection (logion 80).

Moreover, Jesus says in logion 27: "If you do not abstain from the world you will not find the kingdom". There are some other logia with the same tendency. Thus we see Jesus wondering, in logion 29, "that this great wealth [i.e. the spirit] has settled down in this poverty [i.e. the flesh, the human body]".

There is a logion (no. 2) mentioning the stages of progressive knowledge: "He who seeks must not stop seeking till he finds. When he finds he will be bewildered. When he is bewildered he will marvel and he will reign over the universe."²

It is by no means sufficient to know the worthlessness of the material world. The indispensable perfection of knowledge is knowing oneself. For even "he who knows all the universe

¹ Cf. Oxy 654; James, p. 26, Prologue.

² Cf. Oxy 654; James, p. 26 i, G. Hebr, James, p. 2.

but does not know himself has missed everything " (logion 67). On the other hand he who knows himself has reached a standard high above the material world. " Jesus said : He who finds himself, the world is not worthy of him " (logion 111).

We find also some hints in the text as to what knowledge of oneself consists. " When you know yourselves you will be known and you will know that you are the sons of the living Father " (logion 3).¹ In logion 50 we read : " If you are asked who you are, answer : We are the sons and the elect of the living Father ".

I think we may suppose that " to be sons of the living Father " means that there is a divine spark in man, that man has taken his origin from the divine world of light whither the right knowledge (= Gnosis) will lead him back again.

But the great majority of men are not yet open to this knowledge. " Jesus said : I stood in the midst of the world and I appeared in the flesh to them. I found them all drunk and none among them thirsty. My soul was afflicted for the sons of men because they are blind in their heart and do not see that they have come empty into the world and want to go empty out of the world. Now they are drunk. But when they have cast off their wine they will change their minds " (logion 28).² It is a miserable condition not to know one's sonship to the Father : " If you do not know yourselves you are in poverty and you are poverty " (logion 3).

The reverse of the material world is the divine light. Jesus says in logion 50 to his disciples : " If you are asked where you have come from, answer : We have come out of the light where light has come into being by itself." Jesus says in logion 24 : " There is light in a man of light and he gives light to the whole world. If he does not give light there is darkness." Logion 61 reads : " If he [i.e. anyone] is connected [with the Father] he will be filled with light. If he is separated, he will be filled with darkness."

We may suppose that " the beginning ", i.e. the starting point of being, is to be understood as the divine light or the

¹ Cf. Oxy 654 ; James, p. 26, ii.

² Cf. Oxy 1 ; James, p. 27, viii.

living Father. Logion 18 reads : " The disciples said to Jesus : Tell us how our end will be. Jesus said : Have you already ascertained the beginning that you are looking for the end? For where the beginning is, there will be the end. Blessed is he who stands in the beginning and knows the end. He will not taste death." Jesus says in logion 77 : " I am the light that is above all of them. I am the universe. The universe came forth from me and the universe reached to me. Cleave wood : I am there. Lift up the stone and you will find me there." ¹

This logion may seem somewhat inconsistent. But we must keep in mind that people then did not always think in the way to which we are accustomed.

These are the main points we can glean from the text. But there are some details which may be of interest.

The expression " dog in the manger " is well known. Until now I have failed to find anyone who could point to its origin. And yet we find this comparison in logion 102 of our old text. From that we see that it was already quite common at that time. " Jesus said : Woe to the Pharisees for they are like a dog lying in a manger of cattle. Neither does he eat nor does he allow the cattle to eat."

If the reader of the " Gospel of Thomas " should happen not to understand clearly what this means he will find a variant of the saying in logion 39 which reads : " Jesus said : The Pharisees and the Scribes have received the keys of knowledge and have hidden them. They neither did enter themselves nor did they allow those to enter who wished." ²

The difference between the sexes does not play any rôle in Coptic Gnostic texts hitherto known. We may understand it as being in accordance with that question when we read in logion 22 that all the differences, including that of the sexes, must disappear. This is expressed thus : " Jesus saw babies taking suck. He said to his disciples : These babies taking suck are like those who enter the Kingdom. They said to him : Shall we then enter the Kingdom as children? Jesus said to them :

¹ Cf. Oxy 1 ; James, p. 27, x, for the two last sentences, which are preceded by a different text.

² Cf. Matt. xxiii. 13 ; Luke xi. 52 ; Oxy 655 ; James, p. 29.

When you make the two one and when you make what is within like what is without, and what is without like what is within, and what is above like what is below, and when you make the male and the female one only, so that the male will not be male and the female will not be female,¹ when you make eyes in the place of an eye, and a hand in the place of a hand, and a foot in the place of a foot, an image in the place of an image, then you will enter the Kingdom."

In some Gnostic texts Mary Magdalen plays a predominant part² among the disciples and some passages show Peter as her adversary.³ We find this in our text but Jesus' answer to Peter gives the male sex a distinct predominance.

In the last logion (114) we read: "Simon Peter said to them: Let Mary (Magdalen) go away from us, for women are not worthy of the Life". The answer does not reject this view as we should expect, but rather agrees, for Jesus says: "I shall lead her so that I may make her male, that she also may be a living spirit like you males. For every woman who makes herself male will enter the Kingdom of Heaven."

It is doubtful how the reader is to understand how a female can be made male. We may suppose that changing a woman into a man was thought possible by way of reincarnation after death. Reincarnation is an essential feature in the Gnostic doctrine. But on the other hand it is not mentioned in the "Gospel of Thomas." Moreover, there are other possible ways of understanding this logion. Many passages of our text are obscure for various reasons or may be understood in different ways. As soon as the text is published and generally available comparisons will be possible which will shed more light on these passages.

The compiler of the "Gospel of Thomas" did not think much of fasting, giving alms, observing a diet, or even praying. There are some sayings which show that clearly. E.g. logion 6: "His disciples asked him, they said to him: Do you wish us to fast, and how shall we pray? Are we to give alms? And which

¹ Cf. G. Egy, James, p. 11.

² Salome, Christ's midwife, mentioned in some apocryphal texts, says in logion 61 that she is a disciple of Jesus.

³ Cf. my edition of the Berlin gnostic manuscript 8502 (mentioned in note 3 of page 447), p. 31, Coptic text: 17, 15 ff.

diet shall we observe? Jesus said : Do not tell lies and do not do what you hate because everything is manifest before Heaven. For there is nothing hidden that will not be revealed, and there is nothing covered that will remain without being uncovered."¹ This certainly means that, in the opinion of the writer, to be true in words and deeds is much better than all "good deeds".

The same idea is expressed in a much stronger way in logion 14 : "Jesus said to them : If you fast you will acquire sin, and if you pray you will be condemned, and if you give alms you will do evil to your spirits. When you go to any land, and when you walk in those countries, eat what they will set before you when they receive you, and heal the sick among them. For what will enter your mouth will not defile you. But what comes out of your mouth, that will defile you."

In logion 104 we see fasting and praying reserved for special occasions only. "They said to him : Come, let us pray to-day and fast. Jesus said : What is the sin that I have committed or in what have I been vanquished? But when the bridegroom comes out of the bridal chamber, then let them fast and pray."²

What is eaten takes on the nature of the eater. This is said in a drastic way in logion 7 : "Jesus said : Blessed is the lion which the man eats and the lion becomes man. But abominable is the man whom the lion eats and the man becomes lion." The same idea is expressed in logion 11 where we read : "When you ate the dead you made it living".

Among the logia brought together in the "Gospel of Thomas" there are some parables relating to the Kingdom of Heaven.³ Most of them are known from the canonical Gospels, although not all are used there as parables of the Kingdom, e.g. the parable of the lost sheep of Matt. xviii. 12 and Luke xv. 4. We find the same parable in a slightly changed form in logion 107 where it is introduced in this way : "Jesus said : The Kingdom is like a shepherd who has one hundred sheep, etc."

Like all the logia which we find in both the canonical Gospels

¹ For the end of this logion cf. Oxy 654, James, p. 26, iv.

² Cf. G. Hebr, James, p. 6.

³ Cf. L. Cerfaux—G. Garitte, "Les paraboles du Royaume dans l'Évangile de Thomas", *Le Muséon*, lxx (Louvain, 1957), 307-27.

and the "Gospel of Thomas", the parables of the Kingdom are changed in some way in our text. As an example we may cite the parable of the treasure hidden in the field.

In Matt. xiii. 44 it reads : "Again the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field ; the which when a man has found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath and buyeth that field ".

We find a short story made of this in logion 109 : "Jesus said : The Kingdom is like a man who had a treasure hidden in his field without knowing it. After his death he left it to his son. The son did not know it. He took that field and sold it. He who bought it came to plough and found the treasure. He began to lend money at interest to those he wished."

There are some parables in the "Gospel of Thomas" which are not found in the canonical Gospels, e.g. logion 97 : "Jesus said : The Kingdom of the Father is like a woman carrying a jar full of flour, walking a long way. The handle of the jar broke and the flour flowed out behind her on the road. She did not know it, she had not noticed the accident. When she arrived at her house she put the jar down and found it empty."

The next logion (98) reads : "The Kingdom of the Father is like a man who wishes to kill a nobleman. He drew the sword in his house and thrust it into the wall that he might see if his hand would be strong enough. Then he slew the nobleman."

I have only been able to show glimpses of this remarkable text, but I think that the fundamental ideas which we can gather from this collection of sayings of Jesus fit very well into the Gnostic doctrine. Undoubtedly the Egyptian Gnostics were of the same opinion, for they included the text in their library. But I am not qualified to give a final verdict on the matter. That I leave to more competent scholars.

THE BLOODFEUD OF THE FRANKS ¹

By J. M. WALLACE-HADRILL, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF MEDIEVAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

AMONG the debts owed by the Germanic tribes to the Romans must be reckoned, with certain reservations, the debt of law. The earliest *Volksrechte* bear traces of the complex legacy of Roman Vulgar Law.² Few of us now, students of Frankish history and law, could agree with Waitz that "von Recht kann wenig die Rede sein",³ or would deny that the barbarian successor-states do in fact become the more intelligible as the wanderings of the *Codex Theodosianus* and its western derivatives are kept in mind.⁴ And yet a danger lurks here, too; the danger of overlooking the simple truth that the core of all Germanic customary practice was German. This is why I venture to spend a little time upon the most undoubtedly Germanic of all barbarian institutions, the blood-feud, and to invite you to consider it, moreover, not as an incoherent interlude between Gaius and Glanvil but as a sociological experiment instructive in itself. We see, as the barbarians did not, the whole panorama of forces, procedural and moral, arrayed against feud, and to some of them I shall presently draw attention. We note the development from the private feud-settlements of the Germans to public and royal arbitration and intervention,

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 12th of November 1958. I wish to thank Mr. Philip Grierson and my wife for reading the lecture in draft and for making several valuable suggestions.

² See, for example, Ernst Levy, *West Roman Vulgar Law, The Law of Property*, (1951) and *Weströmisches Vulgarrecht, das Obligationenrecht* (1956); J. F. Lemarignier, "Les actes de droit privé de Saint-Bertin au haut moyen âge. Survivances et déclin du droit romain dans la pratique franque", *Rev. Internat. des Droits de l'Antiquité*, vol. 5 (1950); J. Gaudemet, "Survivances romaines dans le droit de la monarchie franque du Ve au Xe siècle", *Revue d'histoire du droit*, vol. xxiii (1955).

³ *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, i (1880), 200.

⁴ The point is developed in J. M. Wallace-Hadrill and J. McManners, *France, Government and Society* (1957), pp. 36-60.

even if we do not always see the corollary, that the legal processes of the *Volksrechte* succeeded just because they derived from feud-processes and closely followed them. We note, too, the continuing pressure of the Church and of Late Roman legal tradition in favour of the abandonment of feud. None of this can be gainsaid. But the death of feud and the better things that replaced it I now leave aside to face the fact of its life. Allowing for all these pressures upon it, feud yet lived for centuries in Western Europe without frontal attack and without stigma. What, then, was its indispensable strength? What actually happened when feud threatened and broke out?

I mean to limit myself to the evidence of those who witnessed and described feuds that we can still read about; but before turning to them there are certain preliminary matters that you will expect me to clarify.

In the first place, it is not difficult to arrive at what, for these purposes, is a working definition of feud. We may call it, first, the threat of hostility between kins; then, the state of hostility between them; and finally, the satisfaction of their differences and a settlement on terms acceptable to both. The threat, the state and the settlement of that hostility constitute feud but do not necessarily mean bloodshed. Indeed, I would not be positive that a legal right to blood, however we understand it, should ever be assumed among the Franks without proof. There is no mention of such right in *Lex Salica*, and the famous rebuke of the *iudex loci* to the man who avenged his brother's death without leave points in another direction.¹ But of moral right there is no question. Feud is never a crime until it is made so, and cannot till then be studied within the context of criminal law. In brief, it is a way for the settlement of differences whether through violence or negotiation or both,² even though it would be vain to look for any such definition in the sources of the early Middle Ages. We must search for our feuds, incipient or flourishing,

¹ Gregory of Tours, *Vitae Patrum*, 8, 7 (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum*), i (1884), 697.

² Professor D. Whitelock, *The Beginnings of English Society* (1952), p. 43, makes clear this intimate connection. She further thinks that in England the heavy expense of homicide-payment had much to do with the continuance of feud by fighting.

in a maze of terms that can mislead: the Frankish *faithu* latinized as *faidus*¹ may mean what we are after, or it may mean something different; feud may lurk behind *inimicus*, *hostis*, *vindicta*, *intentio*, *altercatio*, *bella civilia* or it may not. As an institution, feud remains undefined by its practitioners. If they help us to distinguish feud from any and every sporadic outbreak of violence they do so unwittingly. All vengeance is not feud, and all bloodshed is not bloodfeud. If we really wish to see bloodshed practised as a fine art, we cannot do better than turn to Byzantium, mistress of the West in this as in so much else

Allow me, next, to define the limit of my treatment. *Vendetta* may be studied, even today, in almost any quarter of the globe, in Arabia or Africa, for instance, or nearer home among patriarchal societies in the mountains of Albania, Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica; and it is so studied by the sociologist.² We can learn from him and afterwards look with a new eye to the more particular study of feuding in medieval Europe, and paradoxically may find it easier not to use events of the tenth century to illustrate situations in the fifth, and not to think that Anglo-Saxon laws or Scandinavian sagas are applicable to the Frankish or the Gothic scene.³ Just here the great German legal historians came to grief, though it is easy to see why they did so. My concern is with the Franks of Gaul in the Merovingian age, and I shall resist the temptation to take as evidence the feuding

¹ It may, significantly, mean the injured party's share in composition. Cf. H. Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, i (1906), 231; *Lex Salica*, 35 (ed. K. A. Eckhardt, *Pactus Legis Salicae*, 65 *Titel-Text*, 1955); and J. M. Pardessus, *Diplomata*, ii (1849), no. 431, p. 229.

² I owe much to Max Gluckman's *Custom and Conflict in Africa* (1955). Margaret Hasluck, *The Unwritten Law in Albania* (1954) and I. Shapiro, "The Sin of Cain", *J. R. Anthropological Inst.*, 85 (1955) are suggestive.

³ The point is forcibly made by F. L. Ganshof, "L'Étranger dans la monarchie franque", *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, vol. x, pt. 2 (1958), 8. This is not to say that the student of Frankish feuding can neglect the important general ideas contained, for example, in English writings on Anglo-Saxon feuds—e.g. in F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (2nd. edn., 1947); F. Pollock and F. W. Maitland, *The History of English Law*, vol. ii (1895) and Maitland's *Collected Papers*, vol. i (1911); R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf, an Introduction* (1921); H. M. Chadwick, *The Heroic Age* (1926); F. Seebohm, *Tribal Custom in Anglo-Saxon Law* (1911); and B. S. Phillpotts, *Kindred and Clan* (1913). Nor can he overlook the excellent evidence of the feuds of the Lombards.

practices of the barbarian contemporaries of the Franks, apart from such as were intimately connected with them, like the Burgundians or the Visigoths; neither shall I call upon the practices of Carolingian Europe, where feud of a very different sort may be studied. My evidence is Frankish, and specifically literary; the evidence of the historians and the chroniclers and the writers of saints' *Lives*. Why should they have included their tales of feud? Was it as a warning to the curious or could they not resist a good story? Did they report the exceptional or the commonplace? Why is their evidence sometimes at variance with what the Frankish laws bid us believe?

To the Hun, Attila, there was nothing like a good feud: "quid viro forti suavius quam vindicta manu querere?"¹ He spoke thus for warriors far beyond, and more civilized far, than his own Hunnic warbands. All the barbarian invaders of the Empire loved a feud. Not even the learned Cassiodorus could suppose otherwise.² We may term it the classical feud of the migrating period, though, of course, it lasted longer; it was that kind of kin-hostility where there was killing in hot blood and with all publicity for the sake of honour, most particularly in avenging an act of treachery.³ This was the true vengeance, girt about with a magical symbolism that may have remained potent for much longer than we know. Hot blood was never to be overlooked; while in it a man and his kin might be excused almost anything, and no amount of teaching ever quite persuaded the medieval mind that it was wrong. It will crop up, in various forms, in my evidence.⁴ But it is only one

¹ Jordanes, *Getica*, ch. 39 (ed. Th. Mommsen, *M.G.H., Auct. Antiq.*, i, pt. I (1882), 110).

² *Variae*, bk. I, letter 38; *M.G.H., Auct. Antiq.* xii (1894), 36.

³ R. W. Chambers pointed out that an act of treachery made the acceptance of composition particularly difficult (op. cit. p. 278).

⁴ Cf. F. Dahn, "Fehdegang und Rechtsgang der Germanen", *Bausteine*, ii (1879), 80, 83, 106, 108; Brunner, *DRG.* i. 129, 222; and Julius Goebel, *Felony and Misdemeanor*, i (1937), 85. Goebel's misleading sub-title, "A study in the history of English criminal procedure", has caused this volume, which is largely concerned with Frankish procedure, to be somewhat overlooked on the continent. It attacks Brunner's theory of the Germanic "peace" and hence of outlawry while still regarding feud as "an interminable antiphony of violence". There is, however, an important review by Heinrich Mitteis, reprinted in his *Die Rechtsidee in der Geschichte* (1957). As concerns the study of feud, Goebel's

kind of feud, and there were many others (at least in the Merovingian era) that arose out of theft, cattle-rustling, accidental injury or mere misunderstanding. The tariffs of the *Volksrechte* warn us at a glance that homicide was but one among many injuries from which feud might spring. The facts hardly suggest that the Franks spent more than a small portion of their time defending their honour. Blood tends to cool. The interesting cases of feud are seldom clear-cut affairs of honour and betray, even then, the natural pulls inherent in feud-society towards settlement and composition. Fighting may be fun, but only a grievous injury or a series of misunderstandings will lead to the destruction of the man-power of a family, let alone of a kin. Composition, offering a natural escape, stretches back far beyond the tariffs of *Lex Salica* to composition in kind in the early Germanic period. The world, private and official, stood ready to arbitrate.

Of the pressures working against whatever traditional forms of feud the Franks brought to Gaul, one was the extreme complexity of Gallo-Frankish society. Already far advanced from the comparative simplicities of Tacitus's *Germania*, the Franks of the fifth and sixth centuries settled in a variety of ways upon the Gaulish countryside. We find them at home in abandoned Roman *villae*, at work in small or large groups upon upland ranches, mixing in varying proportions and over a long period in Gaulish or barbarian settlements other than Frankish.¹ How, in these circumstances, could the kin remain a coherent social force? Kindred must rapidly have become scattered over wide areas and the ties of blood within a single settlement become hopelessly intermixed. You could leave your kin and presumably join another;² and the claims of lordship

special merit is to have summarized the conclusions of a very important study by Franz Beyerle, *Das Entwicklungsproblem im germanischen Rechtsgang*, I. *Sühne, Rache und Preisgabe in ihrer Beziehung zum Strafprozess der Volksrechte* (Heidelberg, 1915), published as vol. x, pt. 2, of *Deutschrechtliche Beiträge*.

¹ R. Latouche, *Les origines de l'économie occidentale* (1956), pp. 41 ff. summarizes recent work.

² *Lex Salica*, 60 (*De eum qui se de parentilla tollere vult*) and 46 (*De acfatmire*). See the remarks of Max Pappenheim, "Über künstliche Verwandtschaft im germanischen Rechte", *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Germ. Abt.* xxix (1908), 313, 320.

(already active in Tacitus's time) might well pull against the claims of kin.¹ How could the kin charged with responsibility for feud, whether the agnatic kin or the wider circle of blood-relations,² be mobilized for war except as a small *ad hoc* vengeance-group? So we arrive somewhere near the situation envisaged in another context by Professor Gluckman, where the mere elaboration and interdependence of kin-groups may ensure a kind of immobility. Common blood and propinquity will always make for settlement. This is not to imply that feud-war will not break out on a minor scale nor that the idea of fighting is abandoned. Far from it. The sanction of feud-war is the reality that lies behind every feud-settlement and agreement to pay and receive composition; but it is difficult to implement and not lightly to be entered upon, even when a man has a lord to uphold his quarrel or is himself a lord strong in dependents, whether or not of his blood. (One may suspect that in practice the assistance of kindred and of such dependents was often not clearly distinguishable.) The kin, especially such members as lived within easy reach, must often have been called upon to meet and act as judges and arbiters in family disputes that were none the less feud-disputes because unlikely to lead to bloodshed. They it was who agreed to pay, or to accept, the heavy price of blood, or to disown the offending kinsman; and other duties too were thrust upon them, beyond what the *Volk'srechte* reveal.³ The Frankish kin was probably less often involved as a fighting force than as a composing one. From the mere nature of their settlement, it must be wide of the mark to conceive of the Franks being at all often engaged in major kin-warfare.

Against feud also stood the Church, its teaching and its practice opposed to bloodshed.⁴ There can be no doubt that

¹ I agree with T. H. Aston that "relatives and followers were never mutually exclusive categories" (*Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 5th series, viii (1958), 79). Nor must we overlook the added complexity of the godparental relationship; cf. Pappenheim, *op. cit.* 307, and J. P. Bodmer, *Der Krieger der Merowingerzeit und seine Welt* (1957), p. 40.

² Brunner, *DRG.* i., 112, 120.

³ See *Lex Salica*, 58 (*De chrenecruda*) and 62 (*De compositione homicidii*); *Formulae Salicae Bignonianae* 8, *Noticia de homicidio* (*M.G.H., Formulae* (1886), p. 230); *Pactus pro tenore pacis* 2 (*M.G.H., Capit. Regum Franc.* i. (1883), 4).

⁴ This is well expressed in Lot, Pfister and Ganshof, *Les destinées de l'empire en occident* (1940), p. 310. See also A. Michel, "Vengeance", *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, xv, 2 (1950), cols. 2613-23.

the Frankish Church was for arbitration and composition; Gregory of Tours himself describes for us an occasion when he acted in person as arbitrator.¹ Such is the sense of the well-known words of Avitus on the subject,² the plea of St. Bonitus for *concordia*,³ St. Germanus on *inhonesta victoria*,⁴ the whole tenor of the fascinating *Liber Scintillarum* of Defensor of Ligugé,⁵ to say nothing of the Church's intimate connection with our earliest manuscripts of the *Volksrechte*. (We can associate some of these manuscripts with a known church or churchman, as for instance one fine collection with St. Gallen, or the ninth-century copy of the *Lex Baiuvariorum*, now in Munich,⁶ with Bishop Hitto of Freising.) But how will you get arbitration without the sanction of bloodshed? How, if a cleric, can you be sure of putting from your mind the claims of your own blood? One Frankish bishop at least, Badigisil of Le Mans, made no bones about this: "non ideo, quia clericus factus sum, et ultur iniuriarum mearum non ero?"⁷ He might, had he known it, have cited in his favour a letter from a pope to an Italian *Magister Militum*, instructing him to avenge the bearer for his brother's murder.⁸ More interesting, however, are the difficulties in which less bellicose clerics found themselves. How could they reconcile their views with that *ultio divina* that was their own main prop in a wicked world? Look through his writings for the view of Gregory of Tours on divine vengeance and you will find that he visualizes it as nothing less than God's own feud in support of his servants, who can have no other kin. God will avenge crimes specially heinous in the Church's eyes—parricide for example, crimes within the family generally and crimes involving all who lack natural protectors. The agent of vengeance may be God himself directly intervening to strike down the culprit (for instance, with sickness) or it may be a human agent, as the king. At all events, God's vengeance is of

¹ *Historiarum Libri*, ed. Krusch and Levison, *M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.* (1951), bk VII, ch. 47.

² *Hist. Lib.*, bk III, ch. 6. ³ *M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.* vi (1913), 121.

⁴ *M.G.H., Epist.* iii (*Epist. Mero. et Karo. Aevi*, i) (1892), p. 123.

⁵ Edited by Dom Henri Rochais in *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*, cxvii, pt. i (1957).

⁶ Clm. 19415.

⁷ Gregory, *Hist. Lib.*, bk. VIII, ch. 39.

⁸ *M.G.H., Epist.* iii, 696.

the same nature as that of any head of a family or warband. He strikes to kill, to avenge insult to himself, to his children or to his property. The Frankish churchmen cannot in any other way see *ultio divina* in a society dominated by the bloodfeud.¹ We may know that Romans xii, 19—"mihi vindicta, ego retribuam dicit Dominus"—has nothing to do with bloodfeud, but to the Franks and Gallo-Romans it was not so clear.² We must not, then, expect to find Gregory of Tours, brought up to bloodshed, protected by an avenging God and on at least one occasion more than indulgent towards the ferocious treachery of his hero Clovis,³ opposed to all bloodfeuds merely because they were bloody. His attitude and that of his contemporaries, constituting the attitude of his Church, is, in general, opposed to the sanction of bloodfeud but tends in practice, and for no shameful reason, to be equivocal. He is often opposed to bloodfeuds without seeing the need to state and maintain a case against bloodfeud.

Roman Law, on the other hand, had no need to be equivocal. It had had no truck with feud since the far-off days of the XII Tables.⁴ The Theodosian Code and its Visigothic derivatives take their stand on the personal responsibility of the criminal, the *auctor sceleris*;⁵ his kin should not suffer for him: "*ille solus culpavilis erit qui culpanda commiserit.*"⁶ The Burgundian

¹ Examples of the attitude of the Frankish Church to divine vengeance are: Gregory, *Hist. Lib.*, bk. I, chs. 2, 41; bk. II, ch. 10; bk. III, chs. 5, 28; bk. IV, ch. 20; bk. V, ch. 5; bk. VII, chs. 3, 29; bk. x, ch. 13; also *M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.* iv. 710, 715, 731; *ibid.* vi. 281, 377; *Vita Columbani*, ed. Krusch (1905), p. 213.

² Romans xii. 19 is in fact cited at the close of the account of how God protected St. Willibrord from the custodian of the idol on Walcheren (*Vita Willibrordi*, ch. 14; *M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.*, vii, 128).

³ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. II, ch. 42.

⁴ On the situation before the XII Tables, see David Daube, *The Defence of Superior Orders in Roman Law* (1956), pp. 19 ff. See footnote 1, p. 483. For a comparable Old Testament situation, cf. Sharipo, *loc. cit.* p. 36, where it is emphasized that Deuteronomy xxiv. 16 ("every man shall be put to death for his own sin") belongs to one of the later legal codes.

⁵ Apart altogether from Roman Law, the Germanic kindred shows some tendency to make the wrongdoer personally responsible, especially when faced with finding a heavy wergild.

⁶ *Lex Visig. Recessvind.*, VII, *Antiqua* (ed. K. Zeumer, *Leges Visigothorum Antiquiores*, 1894, p. 180, who also cites II *Dig.* xlviii, 4—*extinguitur crimen mortalitate*).

and Merovingian kings were in varying degrees influenced by their legal advisers in this direction.¹ Burgundian Law in particular tends towards compromise; it admits, for example, occasions when a kin might pursue a killer without, however, pursuing the killer's kin.² But even in Visigothic Spain, a stronghold of Vulgar Roman Law, King Wamba was quite clear that any killer was in the *potestas* of the injured kin.³ If the Visigoths and the Burgundians found difficulties in applying Roman practice among peoples otherwise inclined, we might well look for trouble with the Merovingians.

One question, therefore, on which we must search for light in the Frankish evidence, is the extent to which the Merovingian kings succumbed to these pressures and turned against feud. Some distinguished scholars have had no doubt that they succumbed very largely;⁴ but a different case could be argued. What, it might be asked, could the Frankish kings do with a disintegrating kin-system in which the individual more and more escaped from kin-responsibility and kin-protection? What active, legislative support could they lend to a situation where in practice, as Maitland saw in an English context, every new feud demanded an entirely fresh kin-grouping?⁵ The Merovingian ethos remained independent of, if not unaffected by, the teaching of Church and civilians; it was, as we shall see, still right in Merovingian eyes to enter upon the process of feud, whether it was to lead through bloodshed or composition to ultimate satisfaction. Without the sanction of blood, composition would have stood a poor chance in a world lacking not simply a police-force but any concept of public order.⁶ It is easy to imagine that, with the recording of the *Volksrechte* and the publication of instruments like the *Decretio* of Childebert II,

¹ Cf. F. Olivier-Martin, *Histoire du droit français* (1948), p. 56.

² *Lex Burg.* ii. 7, *M.G.H., Leges*, Sect. I, ii, pt. I (1892), 43; cf. *Lex Burg.* xviii, *ibid.* p. 56; and see the sensible interpretation of E. Levy, *Das Obligationenrecht*, p. 347.

³ Cf. Brunner, *Forschungen* (1894), p. 492. Cf. *Hist. Wambae*, ch. 9, *M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.* v., 508.

⁴ E.g. Olivier-Martin, *Histoire*, p. 127; Goebel, *Felony and Misdemeanor*, pp. 21, 27.

⁵ *History of English Law*, ii. 239.

⁶ Goebel, *op. cit.* pp. 39-43.

the *Pactus pro tenore pacis* and the documents of the formularies of Marculf and others, we have moved into a new world of royal authority. I would be the last to deny that the earlier Merovingians were extraordinarily powerful and much feared. But yet, when we come to inquire what it was that made the composition-tariffs of *Lex Salica* work and why wergilds and lesser compositions were in fact paid, the answer is not fear of local royal officials but fear of feud; or rather it is both. To be sure, the Merovingians have an interest in intervening in the course of feuds when possible and where they can see profit accruing to the fisc through fine or confiscation; the *fredum* was worth having; this is expressed procedurally;¹ but at what time in barbarian history would chieftains not have intervened in the feuds of their followers for similar reasons?² The Romans did much the same. No new principle was at stake. I detect no blow at the principle of feuding in the famous titles of King Chilperic's *Edictum*:³ namely (*tit.* 8) that the *malus homo* (that is, professional malefactor), who cannot make composition and whom his kin will not redeem, may be turned over to his accusers, and (*tit.* 10) that the *malus homo* who cannot redeem himself and is beyond the control of his kin may be slain by anyone without incurring risk of feud.⁴ Is King Childebert deliberately narrowing the function of feud when he forbids killing *sine causa* and decrees that such a killer shall neither make composition nor have it made for him, and that his *parentes* and *amici* shall suffer for it if they try to do so? Brunner thought he was;⁵ I wonder. At least it gave the king a chance to finish his title with a little Roman flourish: "iustum est ut qui novit occidere discat morire." On the other hand, we can cite passages that reveal the Merovingians actively defining and approving occasions of feud, for

¹ Goebel, *op. cit.* pp. 103 ff., 114.

² Cf. *Form. Marculfi*, i, 32 (*M.G.H., Formulae*, 1886, p. 62) insists, naturally enough, that no feud should follow when royal officials have intervened to exact penalties. But this does not seem to have helped Chrodoin in the story in Fredegar's Chronicle, bk. 111, ch. 58 (*M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.* vol. ii). See also Goebel, *op. cit.* p. 90.

³ *M.G.H., Capit. Regum Franc.* i (1883), 8-10.

⁴ See Goebel, *op. cit.* p. 53.

⁵ *DRG.* i. 329; also A. Halban-Blumenstock, "Königsschutz und Fehde", *Zeitsch. der Sav.-Stiftung, Germ. Abt.* xvii (1896), 74. Miss Phillpotts, *Kindred and Clan*, p. 195, seems to me to be seriously astray.

instance, by attempting to sort out the degrees of responsibility for taking vengeance within the kin.¹ As Goebel puts it, the Merovingians were concerned with harsh answers to instant questions: "What is to be done about professional crime? May offenders be executed? Can the fisc take their property?"² Groping for answers and grappling with problems that lay outside the kin (a case in point is murder as distinct from homicide), they now and again struck a glancing blow at feud; traces of such will be found scattered in their laws. But I do not see that this amounts to a deliberate attack upon the principle of feud.

It may be well to state that Gregory of Tours, from whose History much of our evidence of feud is drawn, was not interested in feud as such and he would have been surprised to hear that some historians have seen in his writings the picture of a society disintegrating through feud. Of one special, because unnatural, kind of feud he particularly disapproved, the civil wars between members of one kin, the Merovingians themselves; and in the prologue to his Fifth Book he exhorts them to slay their enemies, not each other. "Cavete bella civilia" he cries, meaning by this that specially heinous type of feud—heinous because self-destroying—the rising of *proximus in propinquam*;³ yet his own evidence shows that this very propinquity in blood was one of the factors that led his warring Merovingians towards settlement. They did not enjoy fighting one another. Let us look at some of Gregory's examples of feud within the royal kin or involving the royal kin.

We may take first a feud between the Merovingians and the royal Burgundian house, a feud brought about by a woman. Gregory gives it some prominence.⁴ The Merovingian queen Chrotechildis, by birth a Burgundian, urges her sons to avenge the deaths of her parents, not on the murderer, her uncle

¹ *Lex Salica*, 41, *add.* 2; *Lex Ribvaria*, 77 (ed. F. Beyerle and R. Buchner, 1954, p. 129); also Brunner, *DRG.* i. 226 and Beyerle, *Das Entwicklungsproblem*, p. 500.

² *Op. cit.* p. 62.

³ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. V, prol. Exile and confiscation were a characteristic Frankish reaction to the killing of near relatives (cf. Goebel, *op. cit.* p. 109).

⁴ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. III, ch. 6.

Gundobad, but on his sons, Sigismund and Godomar. In other words the Merovingian princes were being required by their mother to attack their second cousins. This they proceeded to do and, defeating the Burgundian princes, imprisoned one of them, perhaps with the intention of obtaining a heavy composition. It is only on a later occasion, after a second attack had become necessary, that the Merovingian Chlodomer decides to kill the imprisoned Sigismund and his family: they are all thrown down a well. There is more to the feud than this; but observe its features: two royal kins, related by marriage but distinct and separated by a considerable distance, show no hesitation in attacking one another, the one taking vengeance for blood on the second generation of the other. Yet there is something to suggest that complete and early submission by the Burgundians might have induced the Merovingian princes to accept a settlement on terms. But the Burgundians would not submit. Gregory himself has no adverse comment to make on the reason for the feud.¹ We must suppose that he thought it justifiable. What he disapproves of is the slaying in cold blood of the captive prince and family as an act rather of military prudence (to prevent attack in the rear) than of vengeance intended from the first. Chlodomer himself deserved to die by a ruse in the subsequent battle: his head was raised on a spear, so publicly demonstrating the Burgundian viewpoint in the feud.

Gregory has other cases of Merovingian feuds with princes outside the Frankish orbit. One, that between the Ripuarian Franks and the Thuringians, follows directly on the Burgundian feud.² The *iniuria* of which the Frankish king here complained was a breach of trust: it did not prevent his killing his Thuringian rival by a trick. Trickery, indeed, was a commonplace of Frankish feuding; it might happen at any stage of a feud short of the final agreement and particularly in the penultimate stages of arbitration or armistice; and nobody thought any the worse of it.³ An entire group of Merovingian feuds was waged

¹ Some historians look upon the story as essentially a myth. I do not know why.

² *Hist. Lib.*, bk. III, ch. 7 and 8.

³ Goebel, *op. cit.* p. 29: Beyerle, *op. cit.* pp. 117 ff.

with their southern neighbours and connections by marriage, the Visigoth kings.¹ We find King Childebert marching to Spain to avenge his sister, wife of the Arian Amalaric. She had sent him a bloodstained handkerchief in proof of the treatment she had suffered for her faith.² His motive in marching to kill Amalaric was not brotherly affection; it was duty; and duty normally did dictate such kin-action.³ But duty could be satisfied short of bloodshed; for, a little later, Gregory tells of the Merovingians sending to the Visigoth Theodohat for proper composition for the killing of their cousin, a lady who deserved her fate if anyone did; and in fear he paid them 50,000 *aurei*.⁴ Inevitably he had been threatened with destruction if he failed to pay; that was the sanction of the composition. Dalton long ago showed how inaccurate the story was in detail;⁵ and yet the point remained for Gregory's readers: the death of Theodohat's victim was shameful, feud was the only answer—and composition was perfectly in order.

An independent group of Merovingian-Visigoth feuds involve Gunthramn, Merovingian king of Burgundy. Gunthramn is a rich gift to the historian of feud. A prudent, calculating man, and ruler of the most romanized part of Frankish Gaul, one might well expect to find his face, if anybody's, set against feuding. Yet it is not. Gunthramn is all for feud and keenly aware of his duties as senior representative of his kin. Enraged at the death of his niece Ingundis and of her Visigoth husband, Hermenegild, he arranges to attack Spain, which leads his adversary to plan elaborate distractions for him in Gaul.⁶ But

¹ I leave out of account an allegedly apochryphal tale related in bk. II, ch. 58 of Fredegar's chronicle (*M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.*, ii. 82-3) of the feud between Clovis and the Visigoths, who came armed to parley with the Franks and were adjudged by Theodoric the Great, acting as arbiter, to owe as composition that amount of gold that would cover a mounted warrior with spear erect. Beyerle, *op. cit.* pp. 269, 313 ff., 328, 349, has emphasized the importance of the description for arbitration procedure for the feuds of Fredegar's own day. See also *Form. Marc.*, II. 16, 18 (*M.G.H. Form.*, pp. 85, 88) and *Form. Andecavenses*, 6, 42 (*ibid.* pp. 6, 19).

² *Hist. Lib.*, bk. III, ch. 10.

³ The point is made by J. P. Bodmer, *Der Krieger*, p. 20.

⁴ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. III, ch. 31.

⁵ *The History of the Franks by Gregory of Tours*, ii (1927), 513-14.

⁶ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. VIII, ch. 28.

Gunthramn's implacable hatred, it must be emphasized, had to do with avenging the death of Ingundis. He will not, he says, receive an embassy from the Visigoth Reccared "donec me Deus ulcisci iubeat de his inimicis",¹ neither should his other niece, Chlodosind, go as a bride to the land where her sister was slain—"I cannot tolerate it that my niece Ingundis should go unavenged".² This he declares, although the Visigoths were ready to close the feud by giving the most solemn oath to make amends.³ The ramifications of this feud were substantial and indirectly involved the Eastern Emperors, in whose hands was the little son of the princess Ingundis. Letters were exchanged⁴ and there was some coming and going of ambassadors by way of imperial Africa. It was in Carthage that the ambassadors of King Childebart were slain in a brawl. The Emperor Maurice offered twelve men as compensation: the Franks might do as they liked with them, or alternatively the Emperor would redeem them at 300 *aurei* each. The offer was rejected: how did Childebart know that these men were the guilty men, or, come to that, even free men?⁵

Another, and more complicated, group of royal feuds are within the Merovingian dynasty. About some of them hangs that air of tragic necessity that in general was a theme of Germanic literature,⁶ as when a man cannot take vengeance in his own family, though more than once a Merovingian finds that he must pursue and kill a treacherous son.⁷ The most famous of them, involving the entire Merovingian house, sprang from the murder of the Visigothic princess Galswintha by her Merovingian husband,

¹ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. IX, ch. 16.

² *Hist. Lib.* bk. IX, ch. 20.

³ Cf. Beyerle, op. cit. pp. 349, 421.

⁴ *M.G.H., Epist.* iii. 149 ff. I treat with reservation the comments of P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l'Islam*, II, pt. 1 (1956), 95 ff. without however entirely accepting the reconstruction attempted by his critic, Walter Goffart, "Byzantine Policy in the West under Tiberius II and Maurice" (*Traditio*, vol. xiii, 1957).

⁵ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. X, ch. 4.

⁶ Cf. D. Whitelock, *Beginnings*, p. 39.

⁷ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. IV, ch. 20; bk. V, chs. 14, 18. On the technical sense of *hostis* and *inimicus* see Beyerle, op. cit. p. 223. The situation is rather different in *Beowulf*, lines 2435-2443, where a father laments his inability to avenge the death of one son, accidentally slain, upon another.

King Chilperic, allegedly at the instigation of his mistress Fredegundis. Traditions of polygamy died hard among the Merovingians, and the mistresses of Chilperic saw no reason to grant to the Visigothic princess the position of unique influence she demanded; so she died—quietly, and with the evident intention that her great dowry should remain intact in her husband's hands.¹ But Chilperic's royal brothers would have none of this and planned to seize Galswintha's dowry and to avenge her murder by deposing him. One of them, Sigebert, was the husband of Brunecildis, sister of the murdered woman; and but for this, and the undying hatred of Brunecildis for Fredegundis, it may be doubted whether the brothers would ever have taken much notice. What we have, then, is a fraternal feud contrived by wives and stretching over three generations. Of necessity it also involved the royal Visigoth house. Listen to the language of King Childebert, requiring Gunthramn to surrender Fredegundis to his vengeance: "Give up to me this murderer, who killed my aunt [Galswintha] and then my father [Sigebert] and my uncle [Chilperic] and cut down my cousins [Merovech and Clovis]."² Later the demand is repeated; Gunthramn must surrender this sorceress, this killer of kings, to vengeance.³ But he will not, because he is not convinced of the charges; further, she is the mother of a king—and that, to the Merovingians, meant rather more than being the wife of one.⁴ Uncommitted, yet drawn towards it, Gunthramn saw the hopeless tragedy of this feud; he speaks feelingly of the iniquitous custom of killing kings and declares his intention not merely of killing one of the murderers employed, but of pursuing the man's kindred "in nonam generationem"⁵—that is, to the ninth degree of relationship.⁶ He was determined to catch the murderer of his brother Chilperic. How, he asks Gregory of Tours, can he be counted a man if he fails to avenge that death within a year?⁷ The bishop retorts that Chilperic had thoroughly deserved his end

¹ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. IV, ch. 28. Fredegar, bk. III, ch. 60, says that she was suffocated. Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.* vi. 5, does not mention murder.

² *Hist. Lib.*, bk. VII, ch. 7.

³ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. VII, ch. 14.

⁴ I agree with Bodmer, *Der Krieger*, p. 18.

⁵ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. VII, chs. 21, 29.

⁶ Cf. Brunner, *DRG.* i, 325.

⁷ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. VIII, ch. 5.

and this Gunthramn certainly knew without its affecting his view of his own duty. All this and much else springs from the murder of Galswintha. Who shall say that composition might not soon have been reached among the brothers had not their family in practice lived as three distinct families in three distinct realms? However that may be, one of the grimmest features of this Merovingian feud is the employment of hired assassins.¹ If it be argued that such should play no part in feud, it can be asked how otherwise two women were to prosecute a feud in which their menfolk (and above all Gunthramn, head of the family) were by no means always clear where duty lay, particularly when the matter of the dowry was not uppermost. The point is surely plain : it was the wrong kind of feud ; not feuding but feuding within the kin was what led to pointless bloodshed that stopped nothing and offered few of the normal opportunities for compromise and settlement, even if it did offer some abnormal ones. The end of the story is related by Gregory's continuator, Fredegar. To him we owe the unforgettable account² of the arrest of the old queen Brunecildis by Chlotar, her arraignment and condemnation for the deaths of ten Merovingian kings, and finally her horrible death under the hooves of an unbroken horse. Those present at this scene, and Fredegar himself, saw this as the final expiation of a long feud. Is it, perhaps, this expiation rather than "unitary rule" that lends an air of auspicious anticlimax to the subsequent reigns of Chlotar II and Dagobert?

Perhaps I have said enough of royal feud to make my point that, excepting the feud of Brunecildis with Fredegundis and others consequent upon it, there seemed, as a rule, nothing wrong about it to the participants and often not to Gregory. It would be profitable to pursue the course of later Merovingian feuds in the pages of Fredegar and to interpret the relations of Pippin III, first Carolingian king, with Ghislemar³ and with Waiofar of Aquitaine⁴ in terms of family feuding. But in this matter let us leave the last word with Gregory. Towards the close of his History he describes the scene at Poitiers when a riotous princess,

¹ Cf. Beyerle, *op. cit.* p. 246.

³ *Chron. contin.*, ch. 4.

² *Chron.*, bk. IV, ch. 42.

⁴ *Chron. contin.*, chs. 41 ff.

another Chrotechildis, was brought to account. She stood at bay, begging that no violence be done her: "I am a queen", she says, "and a king's daughter, cousin of another king; take care, for the day may come when I shall take my revenge."¹ The blood-vengeance of a Merovingian, in a word, was to be feared; it could be pursued with great resources; composition might not seem attractive as it did with humbler folk (provided always that they were not asked to pay it). The royal kin, moreover, had a way of sticking together and upholding the feuds of its members against other kins, notably outside Frankish Gaul. Yet the forces making for settlement exist all the time, and are on occasion successful. The conscience that is shocked at feuding within the royal kin is not simply ecclesiastical: it is the conscience of a feuding society that rests, even while it disintegrates, on the idea of the unity of the kin.

A second and no less significant group of feuds we may classify as non-royal; in other words, they do not involve the Merovingians as principals, though they often do involve them as kings. In this group, if anywhere, evidence should be forthcoming of royal intention to suppress feud as an institution. I start, as before, with Gregory's contribution.

Two courtiers—*rhetorici*, what is more—fall out because of the arrogance of one of them, named Secundinus, towards the other, Asteriolus.² The king reconciles them, but a fresh *intentio* breaks out. This time the king makes a judgement, which strips Asteriolus of his honours and places him within the power of Secundinus. However, he is protected by the queen, and not till after her death is Secundinus able to claim his rights and kill him. But Asteriolus left a son who, growing up, made preparations to avenge his father—"coepit patris sui velle iniuriam vindicare". Secundinus thereupon fled in panic from one *villa* to another, and finally, seeing no escape, took his own life "ne in manus inimici conruerit". Gregory, relating this, makes no comment; he thought the story worth the telling but had no strong feelings about it. Yet to us it reveals an interesting fact: two families of courtiers, living their lives under the very nose of the king their lord, are able to pursue their

¹ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. X, ch. 15.

² *Hist. Lib.*, bk. III, ch. 33.

differences in feud without the king being able to stop them. First, they ignore the reconciliation he makes, and later, in the second generation, they flout his subsequent judgement by renewing the feud. Nor can Secundinus see any hope of royal protection against the vengeance of his victim's son. Hence he takes his own life. The king can do nothing to stop the feud; indeed, he does something to ensure its continuance. Did he really suppose that the son of the murdered man would hold his peace? It does not look to me as if the king's part in the matter was at all different from that of any other lord called upon to arbitrate between feuding dependents; he did what he could but the issue was one of blood and in the end passed beyond his power to control. Perhaps he let it pass without regret.

Another feud, having certain features in common with the feud of Secundinus, concerns two well-born families who fall out over a wife's repute.¹ The husband's kin go, as was customary, to her father, requiring him either to prove her innocence or to kill her. He decides to take an oath to her innocence and this is made in the presence of both kins in the church of St. Denis in Paris.² But the husband's kin declare this to be a perjury, whereupon swords are drawn and there is bloodshed before the altar although, as Gregory remarks, both kins were "*primi apud Chilpericum regem*". The matter was referred at once to the king, to whom both parties hastened; but he would have nothing to do with them and sent them back to the bishop. They then made composition with the bishop and were forgiven. That is, they were forgiven their riotous behaviour in church; but the feud remained. A few days later, the woman was summoned *ad iudicium* but strangled herself, so closing the matter. It may well be that she took her life on instructions from her father's kin, who by now knew her to be guilty. Whatever the *iudicium* to which she was summoned, one

¹ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. V, ch. 32.

² Beyerle, *op. cit.* pp. 417, 420, 470, discusses the place of the solemn oath in the settlements of feuds and the pronouncements of the *Volksrechte* on adultery. A good example of how a well-supported oath would carry conviction is *Hist. Lib.*, bk. VIII, ch. 9.

cannot but be struck by the limited nature of the king's intervention; there is no question, as Dahn points out,¹ of his punishing breach of the law or of the peace or the shedding of blood among those closely attached to his court. His mind is taken up with the act of sacrilege. The right and the duty of kin to clear or punish a member, man or woman, who has impugned its honour is not called in question by the king—nor, for the matter of that, by the church.

Other feuds involving women make the point with equal clarity, as, for example, when a well-born woman goes off with a priest, darkening the insult to her kin by dressing as a man to escape detection.² Her kin catches her and, “ad ulciscendam humilitatem generis sui”, burns her. Then, surprisingly, they accept composition of 20 *aurei* from the Bishop of Lisieux for the priest, who subsequently runs off with another woman whose husband's kin catch him and torture him, and would have killed him if he had not again been rescued by the Bishop. But the startling feature of the case is the reaction of Gregory of Tours. Does he think the Bishop was right to offer composition for the priest, and the kin to accept it? He does not: to his mind, it was the accursed thirst for gold that caused the first woman's kin to hold the priest to ransom till someone could be found to pay the composition. By implication we are to understand that the priest should have shared the fate of the woman he seduced. All the same, was it no more than the accursed thirst for gold? May it not have been that honour was satisfied with the woman's death and that her kin had no strong feelings about the priest? Wherever feelings are not strong, or are divided, there tends to emerge an inclination towards composition, if only it can be got; and this, it cannot be too strongly insisted, is by Merovingian times felt as part of the feuding process. It crops up in quite unexpected situations, as here, or when Childeric the Saxon paid composition to the sons of the criminal Avius, whom his men had killed in a brawl.³ Gregory is obviously surprised that he should have paid: “composuit tamen”; yet he did—and the sons accepted it.

¹ *Fehdegang*, pp. 99 ff. See also Brunner, *DRG.* i. 127.

² *Hist. Lib.*, bk. VI, ch. 36.

³ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. VII, ch. 3.

There were times, however, when a king would decisively intervene to break an incipient feud. Gregory recounts how a freeborn girl, carried off to the bed of the drunken duke Amalo, struck him with his own sword and he died, though not before he had had time to admonish his retainers that she had done nothing worthy of death.¹ This did not foreclose feud: that was a matter for the dead man's kin to decide; but it did give her a chance. The girl then fled to the king (not to her own kin, of whom nothing is said). Gregory says that the king was moved by pity to grant her her life and further to take her under his written protection against the dead man's kin. This does indeed foreclose feud; and Gregory makes it clear that the *verbum regis* and his *praeceptio* were, in this case, adequate protection. But why did the girl go straight to the king? And why did he protect her instead of leaving her to the protection of her kin? It sounds like a good case for composition; yet of this the king deliberately deprives the dead man's kin. Halban has argued² that the king simply felt that feud would be wrong and that in acting as he did he overstepped normal practice—and this even if she had no kin and thus a special claim to his protection. Goebel, too, has seen here an extraordinary and early instance of the power of the *verbum regis*.³ What neither has noticed is that her victim was a duke who would have come under the royal protection. Is not this why she flees straight to the duke's master and why his first act is to grant her what is forfeit, her life? Thereafter he can excuse her the consequences of feud too. In fact, of course, the girl had a very good case, with the victim's own evidence in her favour. Why should the injured kin have received compensation where the king was prepared to overlook his servant's murder? The king indeed forecloses a feud; but I cannot see that he acted in a way that could be interpreted as a blow at the principle of feud.

One last example and we shall have done with Gregory. He devotes a long chapter⁴ to the feud between Sichar and Aus-tregisil; a feud as instructive as it is intricate. Its outline is as follows: the time is Christmas, and the setting is in the vicinity

¹ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. IX, ch. 27.

² *Königsschutz*, p. 71.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 50.

⁴ *Hist. Lib.*, bk. VII, ch. 47.

of Tours, Bishop Gregory's own see. It is entirely local to Tours, yet Gregory calls it *gravia bella civilia*, for all the world as if two kings at least were locked in mortal strife. Sichar, Austregisil and their friends (local landowners it seems) were giving a party in the village of Manthelan, when the local priest sent a servant to invite them to his house. One of them (presumably Austregisil or a connection) kills the servant, the party clearly having reached an advanced stage. Now Sichar was bound by ties of *amicitia* to the priest and went off to the church, of all places, to lie in wait for Austregisil. A fight ensued, Sichar finally bolting for home and leaving money, clothing and four wounded servants at the priest's house. Austregisil now burst into the house, killed the servants and carried off the goods. We next meet both parties appearing before a *iudicium civium*: it finds Austregisil guilty of homicide and theft. A few days later, *inito placito* (that is, after an arrangement had been reached whereby Sichar was to receive composition and forego further vengeance),¹ Sichar heard that the stolen goods were still in the hands of Austregisil's kinsman Auno, and others of his following; so Sichar renewed the feud by a night attack, when Austregisil and others were slain and much property taken. At this point, Bishop Gregory himself intervened by summoning both parties and, in conjunction with the local *iudex*, he advised them to come to an agreement. He says that he feared that the trouble might spread; sons of the Church were being lost; let the party that was in the wrong make composition; and, most remarkable of all, if he could not afford the composition (which by this time would have been ruinously heavy),² the Church would pay it. But the party of Austregisil, at this stage represented by Chramnesind, son of Auno, refused composition. Sichar now thought that he had better see the king; but on the way he had trouble with one of his slaves, who wounded him.

¹ See the comment of R. Buchner, *Gregor von Tours, Zehn Bücher Geschichten*, ii (n.d.), 154.

² G. Monod stresses this in his account of the feud, "Les aventures de Sichaire", *Revue Historique*, vol. xxxi (1886). See also Beyerle, *op. cit.* p. 523, who cites the gloss on *Lex Salica*, 58: "Lege, quae paganorum tempore observabant, deinceps numquam valeat quia per ipsam cecidit multorum potestas."

The news got about that he was dead. This was the signal for Chramnesind, "commonitis parentibus et amicis", to lay waste Sichar's property and drive off all his cattle. At this point, the count of the city intervened. The judgement was that Chramnesind, having refused composition and then renewed hostilities, should forfeit half the sum originally awarded him, and that Sichar should pay him the other half. The Church then paid the half-composition, as it had promised to do, and both parties swore the solemn oaths of the final settlement and gave *cartae securitatis*.¹ "Et sic", says Gregory with a sigh of relief, "altercatio terminum fecit." But he was wrong; the most interesting part was yet to come. Years later,² and students of Anglo-Saxon history will at once think of a parallel in the feud of Uhtred and Thurbrand,³ we find Sichar and Chramnesind fast friends. They are at dinner together. It crosses Sichar's mind to remark jovially that Chramnesind ought to be very grateful to him for killing off his relatives and so endowing him with a fine composition, without which he would be penniless. Naturally the feud comes flooding back into Chramnesind's mind and he thinks "nisi ulciscor interitum parentum meorum amittere nomen viri debeo et mulier infirma vocare". So he dowses the lights, smashes in Sichar's head, and flees to King Childebert; but not before he has hung his victim's body on a fence and thus fulfilled the requirements of feud that the outcome of vengeance should be publicly displayed and not hidden.⁴ Sichar unfortunately had been a protégé of the queen, the formidable Brunechildis, and Chramnesind had reason to fear the worst. Eventually he was able to prove that he had slain his victim *super se*, which has been understood to mean "for his honour"⁵ or "of necessity".⁶ It was a classic case of *homicidium se defendendo* and he got off.⁷ And that was indeed the end of the feud. Much has been written about it. Gál insists that the

¹ An example of such a *carta*, whereby a man, *intervenientes sacerdotes* and others, accepts a composition on behalf of his kin for the killing of his brother, is *Form. Marc.* II, 18. Cf. Beyerle, *op. cit.* p. 332.

² *Hist. Lib.*, bk. IX, ch. 19.

³ Symeon of Durham, *Opera* (Rolls Series), i. 218-19.

⁴ Cf. *Lex Salica*, 41 *add.* 2; *Lex Ribvaria*, 77. ⁵ Dalton, *op. cit.* ii. 388.

⁶ Buchner, *Gregor von Tours*, ii. 259.

⁷ Beyerle, *op. cit.* 497-8, 256, 353.

court proceedings have the air of a feud tribunal ;¹ Halban sees it as an irruption of royal authority into a feud beyond what the formularies state was customary ;² Brunner insists on detecting a clash between *Volksrecht* and *Königsrecht* ;³ Dahn, on the other hand, thinks that church and king intervene surprisingly little ;⁴ and Goebel equally stresses the feebleness of the intervention of public authority.⁵

And is not this, put another way, the point? Outraged kinship proves too strong for any pacification ; and that this was felt to be morally right is evidenced by the king's final award. But observe, too, the number of checks to bloodshed that are met with on the way. There stands the local court of arbitration, to say nothing of the count, the bishop and the king, ready to throw their weight into the scales on the side of composition and settlement. There is nothing clear-cut about it from start to finish ; the case drifts from blood to arbitration and back again without ever becoming what we would call legally clear. Royal intervention and court procedure are fluid ; the transition from one type of procedure to another is bewilderingly easy ; and this the *Volksrechte* and the formularies would hardly suggest. But they settled it in the end.

Lest it be thought that Gregory alone records the feuds of the Franks, let us turn, leaving him still far from exhausted, to Fredegar. First, the feud of Ermenfred with Chainulf.⁶ It is over in a few words. Ermenfred, son-in-law of the great Aega, kills Count Chainulf at a court held at Augers. In consequence, his landed possessions are savagely attacked by Chainulf's kin and many others, all with the express approval of Queen Nantechildis. Ermenfred seeks refuge in church at Reims and thus escapes the royal wrath. That is all ; it is a stray gleam that reveals a powerful and level-headed queen urging on an injured kin to feud. But Fredegar has a much better feud, that between Flaochad and Willebad.⁷ Nantechildis again, acting as regent, appoints the Frank Flaochad to be mayor of the

¹ *Die Prozessbeilegung nach den fränkischen Urkunden des VII-X Jahrhunderts* (Gierke's *Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 102, 1910), p. 18.

² *Königsschutz*, p. 73.

³ *DRG.* i. 281.

⁴ *Fehdegang*, pp. 90, 99.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 22.

⁶ *Chron.* bk. IV, ch. 83.

⁷ *Chron.*, bk. IV, chs. 89, 90.

palace in Burgundy—a strongminded if imprudent decision. On his first progress through Burgundy, the new mayor came upon the patrician Willebad; and he discovered, says Fredegar, an old hatred that had long lain hidden in his heart. He planned to kill him. For his part, Willebad lost no chance of belittling Flaochad. We next move to a Burgundian court held at Chalon. Willebad arrives with a great following. Flaochad plans an attempt on his life, which is foiled; instead, he marches out of his *palatium* to fight him. Amalbert, Flaochad's brother, interposes to pacify them. Flaochad now calls on the new king, Clovis, to help him. Willebad is summoned to appear before the king at Autun and arrives with a big following, well knowing that Flaochad, Amalbert and others intend to set upon him. The king tries in vain to entice the victim within the city walls; instead, his enemies again have to march out against him. The fight is described vividly. It seems to have been something of a family engagement, with most people sitting round as spectators. Berthar, a supporter of Flaochad, is narrowly saved from death by his son Chaubedo. Willebad is killed. Eleven days later, apparently before the feud had entered a further phase, Flaochad died of a fever. Fredegar here sees divine judgement. Both Flaochad and Willebad were robbers and tyrants; what is more, they had repeatedly sworn friendship on holy relics—that is, had solemnly agreed to terminate feud. It is an interesting scene described, one might think, by an eyewitness: the opponents, typical barbarian warriors quarrelling about we know not what, backed by their kins and their retainers, are each quite ready to make an end of the other by trickery. We are given, too, a straight hint that they had patched up the feud more than once. It ends in a skirmish under the walls of Autun, a skirmish that has something of the flavour of a duel, by which feuds were on occasion terminated.¹ Or rather, it ends in God's judgement on the survivor. Nothing is said of the course of law as it affects the quarrel of such important men; and the king, whether or not present at the final scene, made it possible, even if, a boy, the mouthpiece of others.

To work through the seven volumes of the *Scriptores Rerum*

¹ E.g. Fredegar, *Chron.* bk. IV, chs. 51, 71. Beyerle, *op. cit.* pp. 413 ff.

Merovingicarum is to be made aware that feuds are like volcanoes. A few are in eruption, others are extinct, but most are content to rumble now and again and leave us guessing. Every so often we pass across the edge of a quarrel that, if only the writer had followed it up, would have turned out to be feud. The language of feud and its assumptions lie in the minds of the Frankish chroniclers and hagiographers. Consider the curious account in the much-misrepresented *Vita Dagoberti* of how the sons of Sadregisil failed to obtain their heritage through not having avenged their father's murder;¹ or how the author of the *Vita Anstrudis* prefers not to identify the family that murdered the only brother of Anstrudis, since she sought no vengeance, although they attacked her too: "quorum nomina et stirpem dicere iniuriam esse putamus";² or again, how Ulfus, tortured as he thought through the agency of St. Germanus of Paris, flings his sword-belt at the bishop's feet with the cry "my life will be required of you by the king—and by my kin!"³ It is the same in the story of St. Léger⁴ and of many another Frankish figure whom it would be pointless to enumerate. None of these writers saw feud steadily giving ground to other and less bloodthirsty processes of law sponsored by enlightened kings.

We have come to the brink of the Carolingian age, the age of Charles Martel and St. Boniface. If a new day dawned in the history of feuding, it was concealed from the continuators of Fredegar and the compiler of the *Liber Historiae Francorum*, and concealed too, from Archbishop Hincmar as he looked back

¹ *M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.* ii, 413-14. Krusch here cites *Lex Romana Visigoth. Paul.* iii. 7, 1 (ed. Haenel, p. 384): "quicumque a familia sua occisus fuerit, hereditas illius ab herede adiri non potest nisi prius de familia quaestio fuerit ventilata et mors occisi fuerit vindicata", where, as my colleague, Dr. Arnold Ehrhardt, points out to me, the Roman sense of *familia* should preclude any idea of feud. In Mr. Grierson's view, the Roman state would first have intervened where a family-killing was concerned precisely because feud could not operate effectively; outraged public opinion may have demanded it. Later, a legal action was provided. Finally, the State took over cognizance of homicide itself.

² *M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.* vi, 69-70.

³ *M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.* vii., 385.

⁴ *M.G.H., Script. Rer. Mero.* vol. v.

from the vantage point of the next century.¹ Why did St. Boniface become doubtful about the propriety of regarding Gregory of Utrecht as a likely successor?² Because, it seemed, Gregory might become involved in feud, his brother apparently having killed the uncle of the *Dux Francorum*; and nobody knew how the *discordia* would end. The *Dux* might decide to avenge his uncle's death fairly widely on Gregory's family. We may assume that this did not, in fact, happen; but the career of Gregory of Utrecht might have been very different had it not been for the threat overhanging his kin at a critical moment. The Mainz version of the *Life* of St. Boniface³ affords a sudden insight into the view of feud held by one of the most powerful Frankish dynasties of the Rhineland. Bishop Gerold of Mainz is killed in a skirmish with the Saxons. His son and successor, Gewilib, does not consider this an unavoidable accident of battle. Instead, he makes careful inquiries to discover who actually killed his father, and he succeeds. In due course, while on an expedition against the Saxons with either Charles Martel or Carloman, he seeks out his victim and invites him to meet him in the River Weser to discuss terms.⁴ And there Gewilib kills him, with the words "accipe quo patrem vindico ferrum!" The writer goes on to say that neither the king nor the nobles considered that Gewilib had done anything blameworthy in avenging his father thus, though he (the writer) clearly did. "Rudi populo rudis adhuc presul" is his epitaph for Gewilib, and it sounds well enough; but the great dynasts of the Rhineland would not have thought so, and Gewilib's Carolingian overlord did not think so.

I am not now concerned to consider how far, if at all, the Frankish outlook on feud was modified by Charlemagne. Nobody believes that he was particularly successful; the question is simply what his intentions were.⁵ Nor, again, must we be

¹ *Vita Remegii, praef.*, M.G.H., *Script. Rer. Mero.* iii, 251.

² *S. Bonifatii et Lullii Epistolae*, ed. M. Tangl (2nd edn., 1955), no. 50, p. 83.

³ Ed. W. Levison, *Vitae S. Bonifatii* (*Script. Rer. Germ. in usum schol.*, 1905), pp. 91-2. See E. Ewig, "Milo et eiusmodi similes", *Sanct Bonifatius Gedenkgabe* (1954).

⁴ I understand *sermonicari* in some such technical sense.

⁵ H. Fichtenau, *Das karolingische Imperium* (1949), p. 146 (Munz's trans.,

deceived by developments in court procedure (for example, in the *jurati* being summoned by a judge instead of by the parties to a feud) that tended to strengthen royal resistance to private feud-procedures without necessarily betraying a change of heart.¹ Charlemagne's position, as revealed in his capitularies, may be variously interpreted.² If the *Admonitio Generalis*³ be taken as an indication of policy, then it may be that Charlemagne, viewing his kingly rôle in the light of an Augustinian *pax*, saw feuding as a positive evil and, further, as eminently undesirable by reason of its private nature.⁴ But even his friend Alcuin, we must remember, did not always see things thus.⁵ What I feel sure Charlemagne never experienced was a distaste for the bloodshed of the process. Royal justice could be savager than feud. There may, then, be a positive change of outlook here, such as no Merovingian evidence can plainly be seen to bear traces of; at once the culmination of a process of practical delimiting of feud that was centuries old, and a special development of the late eighth century; feuding in the Carolingian world nonetheless had a long future before it.

What I have been attempting to express is a view of the feuding of the Frankish age that is the reverse of clear-cut—and this because I find no evidence that contemporaries saw it otherwise. To legal historians, feud dies a slow, inevitable death, yielding to the superior equity of royal justice; chaos and bloodshed give place to good order because they must. I see the matter otherwise: feud, as a means of obtaining redress, is already a various, elaborate procedure by the time we first meet it in

The Carolingian Empire, p. 138) notes the flourishing of feud in the Carolingian age and sees no general prohibition; Goebel, *op. cit.* p. 26, thinks that the Carolingians did curb feud to some extent, and used their power to enforce final concords (p. 33). See also Olivier-Martin, *Histoire*, p. 82.

¹ Beyerle, *op. cit.* p. 439; cf. also 319.

² Brunner, *DRG.* i. 329, 410, discusses the evidence.

³ *M.G.H., Capit.* i. 59, esp. §§ 66, 67. Cf. F. L. Ganshof, "Charlemagne", *Speculum*, 24 (1949), 520 ff.

⁴ E. Ewig, "Zum christlichen Königsgedanken im Frühmittelalter", *Das Königtum*, (1956), p. 63. Goebel, *op. cit.* p. 94, summarizes the evidence for an articulate penal theory, aimed at the suppression of wickedness, in Charlemagne's legislation.

⁵ *M.G.H., Epist.* iv. 376.

barbarian sources, long since linked with the payment of compositions, in kind or money; the two are inseparable. Records of feud repeatedly betray the drift from fighting to composition, the vagueness of the line separating them. Always it is touch-and-go what will happen; it will depend on what the kins think, how extensively they or their followings are mobilizable, how rich they are or how ready to pay or receive payment, how much the bishop or the king feels disposed to intervene. The royal position as expressed in legislation is not as a rule clear; and, when it is, it does not always correspond to practice. Kings may sometimes have judged feuding proper to their immediate followers when they would have disallowed it to a wider circle. Royal justice and the local courts are still far too haphazard in function and fluid in procedure to offer a clear alternative to feud. They are more concerned with compromises than with principles.¹ What, in fact, we do find is the movement of men and their troubles between the two. I agree with Goebel that the process of composition "remained essentially an alternative rather than a successor to settlement by violence"² though I would add that the reality of the bloodier alternative was the sanction that made composition possible at any stage. Except generally where honour was obviously involved, kins and families would find reasons and excuses to look to composition first, whether of their own making or under the protection of the courts. Their efforts might break down and often did; and so might the efforts of the courts. There is no strong and continuous royal pressure against the principle of feud, as I see it. There is no "Kampf gegen die Fehde".³ Even the pressure of the Church should be subject to most careful interpretation. Feuds that wiped out whole kins I do not believe were ever common.⁴

¹ The point is well expressed in Lot, Pfister and Ganshof, *op. cit.* p. 310: the spirit of the times showed "l'horreur de l'arrêt qui tranche comme un coup-
eret".

² *Op. cit.* p. 38. See also Beyerle, *op. cit.* p. 261.

³ As Beyerle holds, *op. cit.* p. 264.

⁴ Beyerle, *op. cit.* p. 523 cites *Hist. Lib.* bk. VII, ch. 47, but this does not show that Gregory thought such feuds common. All the narrative evidence points to the difficulty of enlisting the feud-service of more than the closest kin or a very restricted *ad hoc* force.

Feuding in the sense of incessant private warfare, is a myth; feuding in the sense of very widespread and frequent procedures to reach composition-settlements necessarily hovering on the edge of bloodshed, is not. The marvel of early medieval society is not war but peace.

A UNIQUE *KOL-NIDRĒ* PIYYUṬ FROM THE CAIRO GENĪZAH IN THE GASTER COLLECTION IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY ¹

By MEIR WALLENSTEIN, M.A., Ph.D.

SENIOR LECTURER IN MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HEBREW IN
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

THE Hebrew document under consideration, Rylands Genīzah Fragment 1, is written on a coarse yellowish parchment,² measuring 440 × 186 mm. and containing thirty-eight

¹ The following article forms, with some alterations, the second part of a lecture delivered at the Second World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem on 28 July 1957. See "A dated Tenth Century Hebrew Parchment Fragment from the Cairo Genīzah in the Gaster Collection in the John Rylands Library" in BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, vol. 40, No. 2 (March 1958), p. 551, n. 1.

² The parchment has writing on both its sides, and one may conveniently give here a few details of some interest about the writing on the other side. This is a Biblical text, copied by an experienced hand, as it would appear, at a later date than that of the *piyyuṭ*. It begins with היום ממרים (Deut. xxxi. 27) and ends with לולי כעס (ib. xxxii. 27). The first part, being prose, is set out in full lines, and the second part, which forms the beginning of twenty-seven poetical verses of the pericope האויני, is laid out in half lines, indicating parallels. There are only a few lacunae. Unlike the *piyyuṭ* on its opposite side there is hardly any margin left at the bottom of the parchment. Again, the right hand has no margin at all; so much so that some thin parts of its initial letters are missing. Not so is the left hand side. Here, however, about one-third of the margin towards the top and about one-third towards the bottom are impaired in parts—apparently as a result of stitching. It seems, then, to have formed a page in a volume into which Hebrew writings were intended to be inserted. Whether or not the insertions were made with a definite scheme in view is hard to say. All told, there are forty-eight lines having no vowels nor *ziyyūnīn* (crownlets required to be placed on seven letter of the alphabet in the Torah Scrolls), nor *maqṣeph*s. In orthography it differs very slightly from that of the editions of the current Masoretic Texts. Thus אלה, instead of אלוה (Deut. xxxii. 15). דר ודר (Deut. xxxii. 7) is defective, this being in conformity with the current editions of the M.T. as against Biblia Hebraica. Scribal errors are few. ויבע appears instead of ויבעט (Deut. xxxii. 15), with *ṭeth* missing. The lay-out of the parallel lines deviates in a few instances from that given, e.g. in the Biblia Hebraica, thus implying different interpretations.

lines¹ of a liturgical poem. Atmospheric agencies have affected a large number of letters, making them difficult to decipher. The last few lines at the bottom of the page, especially on the left, are heavily mutilated. There are also a few lacunae, some of which, however, are restorable. The shape of the letters of the top two lines betrays two distinct pens;² the one, used in the writing on the right of the page, which occupies about half the space of its breadth, had a broader quill-feather than that used on its left. The broad quill-feather was again used in the writing of the remainder of the thirty-six lines that follow.³ It is hard to conjecture a date for this slovenly-written copy, but perhaps the end of the eleventh century would not be wide of the mark. The poem, framed in the liturgical composition *Kol-Nidré*—known to be recited on the night of *Yom Kippur*—is composed of eighteen verses each containing three rhyming lines, the first two being the composition of the *paytān* (= liturgical poet) and the third a Biblical passage.⁴ A double alphabetical acrostic, not taking account of the Biblical passage, runs through its eighteen verses.⁵ There is no name of the author spelt

¹ Strictly speaking, there are only $37\frac{1}{2}$ lines, for the 38th line contains only a few words.

² The word "pens" needs emphasis, for, though at first sight one is inclined to see two hands rather than two pens, a close examination of the palaeography of the various letters points to a common hand for the whole page.

³ The reason for the change of pen (or perhaps the position of the same pen) may be due to the desire of the copyist in the first instance to allot to each full verse one line only. On reaching the third stroke of the *shin* of שִׁי, however, he apparently became aware that although half of its space had already been spent, only much less than half of the verse had been written. The pen was then changed. This was repeated in the copying of the second verse. The two verses, however, being still too long, a few of the concluding words of the first one had to be written above the end of the line and the concluding words of the second one below the end of the second line. (Moreover, some of them had even to be abridged. See pp. 493, n. 8, 494 2.) This practice was given up from the third verse onwards, where we have verses extending to more than one line.

⁴ However, the eighteenth verse—the first line of which is almost obliterated—is not in conformity with this scheme, as its last two lines are made up of two Biblical passages (see p. 500, notes 13 and 14). Nor are in strict conformity verses 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, and 15, where the Biblical passages are preceded by some introductory words of the *paytān*. Verse 4 is anomalous, combining as it does three Biblical passages (see p. 494, n. 7).

⁵ Exceptions are the second line of the first verse which has a *beth* instead of an *aleph* and the second line of the eighteenth verse, which, being a Biblical

acrostically—a conspicuous feature of *piyyuṭîm* in general. But it is possible that the name was originally embodied as a telistich in the obliterated words of the beginning of the last verse. The eighteen Biblical passages bear on the Eighteen Benedictions¹ of the Morning Prayer. Thus, the first verse ends with “. . . I am (thy) *shield*” (Gen. xv.1) followed by a stroked *beth* indicating, abbreviately, the word ברוך of the first Benediction which concludes with the words “Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the *shield* of Abraham”. The second verse ends with “Thy *dead shall live*, my dead bodies shall arise” (Isa. xxvi. 19). This is again followed by the abridged word ברוך, indicating the second Benediction which concludes with the words “Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who *quickenest the dead*”. And so on. The *piyyuṭ*-pieces, then, were intended to be interwoven in the Eighteen Benedictions while recited by the Reader, and we thus have here a composition known as *Qerôbhāh*.²

What is the significance of this *Qerôbhāh*? Certainly not its contents which, by the nature of things, are somewhat lifeless, as indeed is its frame, the *Kol-Nidrê*,³ to which it owes its animation; nor is it its language which, though containing a few of the general characteristic *piyyuṭîc* elements⁴ which accord it some philological value, lacks the stronger and more striking ingredients peculiar to the Saadyah School⁵ to which one is inclined to attribute the composition.⁶ Its significance

passage, is not in keeping with the alphabetical order and does not embody the required letter צ. (See preceding note.)

¹ Not nineteen, as is customary today. This is in accordance with an old custom which prevailed in Palestine and its neighbouring countries. The Benediction מַצְמִיחַ קֶרֶן יִשׁוּעָה . . . בְּרוּךְ is here left out. Cf. the similar practice in Qalir's *Qerôbhāh* for *Pûrîm* beginning with וַיֵּאָהֵב אֹמֶן framed in Est. ii. 17.

² The origin of this word is doubtful, but M. Seidel's suggestion (*Hiqrê Lāshôn*, Jerusalem, 1942, p. 43) that the meaning of קֶרֶב can be adduced by its parallel הוֹדִינוּ, “we give thanks”, of Ps. lxxv. 2, is worthy of consideration.

³ Having hardly any intrinsic qualities, it nevertheless assumed value owing to its being recited on the awe-inspiring day of *Yom Kippur* as well as to its impressive melody. But this is not the place to enlarge on these matters.

⁴ These are (a) Prolonged inf. (line 17). (b) Anomalous use of the ב כ ל letters (lines 39, 44, and 49). (c) Emblematical terms (lines 13, 18 (two), 22, 23, 37, 38, 42(?) 72(?)). (d) Verb and noun coinages (not recorded in either the Bible or the Talmud) (lines 23 (two), 48, 58, 67, 68 and 72).

⁵ See Zulai, *'Orlogin* 6 (Tel-Aviv, 1952).

⁶ See p. 493.

lies, in the first place, in its frame as such which is, as far as one is able to ascertain, unique in the paytanic literature, where *piyyuṭīm* of the three primary types,¹ framed in Biblical passages bearing on their subject matter are innumerable. Here the frame is not the venerated Bible but a composition of about the second half of the seventh century² of Palestinian origin³ which was frowned upon by most of the Geonim⁴ and which apparently was not found fit enough—at a later date—to be adopted in the Catalanian and Algerian rituals⁵—a composition which contains some mere formulae declaring null and void vows, etc., which an individual voluntarily undertook to himself.⁶

Where does this composition emanate from? Before attempting an answer to this question some remarks on the wording of the frame, in addition to those given in the notes on the text, are here called for. To begin with, the version here is Hebrew and not Aramaic⁷ and follows with some deviations that of SAG. The following are some of its peculiarities: *והקדשות*,⁸ which may be the equivalent of *וקונמי*, of the current Aramaic version,⁹ and not found in SAG, is mentioned by the Qaraite Salmon b. Yeruḥam, a contemporary of Saadyah Gaon,

¹ For forms of *piyyuṭīm*, see my *Some Unpublished Piyyuṭīm from the Cairo Genizah* (Manchester University, Faculty of Arts Pub. 8, 1956) pp. 3-6.

² This is the beginning of the Geonic Period, which commences roughly after the conquest of Babylon by the Arabs.

³ See J. Mann, *Texts and Studies*, ii, Philadelphia, 1935 (= Mann), pp. 52-3. See also, however, I. Davidson, *Ozar ha-Shirah weha-Piyyuṭ*, ii, 480.

⁴ Cf. e.g. R. Amram Gaon (appointed 858, Sura): "But the Revered Academy have sent word saying that this practice (of reciting *Kol-Nidrē*), which is one of folly, is forbidden" (*Sedher R. Amram Gaon*, Warsaw, 1865, (= SAG), p. 47). Naṭornai Gaon, who preceded Amram, speaking of absolution of vows in general, states emphatically that "It is practised neither on *Yom Kippur* nor on *Rosh-ha-Shanah* in either Academies (i.e. Sura and Pumbedita) or in any other place in Babylon". Saadyah Gaon (appointed 928, Sura) was one of the very few Geonim who did not object to it under certain circumstances. See *Siddur R. Saadja Gaon*, Jerusalem, 1941, p. 31 (Assaf's introduction).

⁵ See Zunz, *Ritus*, p. 106.

⁶ Namely, vows which concern only the relations of a person to his conscience and in which no other persons or interests are involved (see, e.g. Rabbēnu Asher to Nedarim 23b).

⁷ The Aramaic is the more known. As to Hebrew versions, see, in addition to SAG, p. 47, *Roma* ii, p. 232; *Roma SHaDaL* ii, p. 69.

⁸ Opening of verse 5.

⁹ See the explanation given to *קונמי* in Nedarim 35a.

in his attack on the reciting of *Kol-Nidrê* by the Rabbanites.¹ *שהשבענו*,² which is here not a Hiph'il but a Hippa'el³ with the function of the Niph'al, corresponds well with the Ethpe'el, *דאשתבענו*, of the current Aramaic version of the one hand⁴ and, on the other, with the Hebrew *ושבענו* of SAG and the Qaraites Sahl b. Mazliaḥ, another contemporary of Saadyah Gaon, and Yehudah Hadassi (twelfth century) in their quoting of the Rabbanites.⁵ The more arresting peculiarity, however, which makes this version unmatched amongst the various other versions, is the opening words of verse 10 which read *מיום ראש השנה שעבר* and its neighbour member,⁶ which should have logically read *עד ראש השנה הבא*. SAG and other versions, including those cited by the Qaraites, read here *הזה . . . מיום הכפורים שעבר עד*,⁷ a wording which does not tally with a Talmudic statement implying *Rosh-ha-Shanah* rather than *Yom Kippur* for the reciting of *Kol-Nidrê*.⁸

Now, does our *Qerôbhâh*, which was obviously intended for the Morning-Prayer of the eve of *Rosh-ha-Shanah*, point to a practice other than the accepted one which prevailed in some

¹ See Mann, p. 51 and Appendix ii, No. 2, p. 85. ² Opening of verse 8.

³ See D. Yellin, *דביר* i, pp. 22-30 and cf. perhaps *השבע* of Num. xxx. 3. See also H. Yalon, *Leshonenu*, 1929, pp. 122-3 and *Tarbitz*, Year III, p. 99, where Talmudic instances of the Hippa'el are discussed. Cf. also Yannai's *היווסד* (= *הָוֹסֵד* = *נוסד*) (Zulay, *Piyyuṭê Yannai*, p. 261, line 5).

⁴ Cf. in this connection also the rendering of the Targum of *ושבע* (Lev. v. 22).

⁵ See Mann, p. 51, and Appendix ii, No. 3, p. 88 and *'Eshkol Hakḥopher*, p. 53a, respectively.

⁶ Not incorporated in the frame owing apparently to the difficulty of the *payṭân* to find a suitable line of his own to connect it, however slenderly, with this particular phrase.

⁷ Selmon b. Yer ḥam, though not giving the same wording, mentions that *Kol-Nidrê* is recited by the Rabbanites on the 9th of Tishre (see Mann, p. 51, Appendix ii, No. 2, p. 85). Here is the place to mention that some versions have *הבא . . . מיום כפורים זה עד*, an emendation introduced by the French tosaphist R. Meir b. Samuel (1060-1135?), who argued that an *ex post facto* undertaking is meaningless, citing, in support of his emendation, Nedarim 23b (see *Sepher Hayyashar*, by Rabṭēnu Tam, Vienna, 1811, p. 17, par. 144).

⁸ Cf. "Whosoever etc. should say at the beginning of the year, etc." (Nedarim 23b) (see preceding note). Studiously sought-out and rather strained explanations were given for the reciting of *Kol-Nidrê* on *Yom Kippur* rather than on *Rosh-ha-Shanah* by Rabṭēnu Tam (twelfth century) and by R. Isaiah di Trani (thirteenth century), (see *Shibbolê Halleqet*, pp. 147a and 146a, respectively).

Jewish community in the Middle-East (in Egypt?) where *Kol-Nidrē* (not necessarily along with the *piyyuṭ*) was recited on the night or day of *Rosh-ha-Shanah*? If this can be assumed, may it be further surmised that the *qerōbhāh* originated under the influence of Saadyah Gaon in order to defy the Qaraites in their pillorying of the Rabbanites for their reciting of *piyyuṭim* and especially *Kol-Nidrē*?¹ Neither what is known about Saadyah Gaon's pungent controversies with the Qaraites, to which an outlet was given even in such an "innocent" work as his translation of the Bible,² nor the structure of the *qerōbhāh*, nor, for that matter, its language, though relatively colourless,³ should exclude such a surmise.⁴

The following is the *qerōbhāh* reconstructed, vocalized and annotated :

כָּל יְדָרִים 1

אֲשֶׁר אִי שְׁלֹא כְהֹנֵן

בְּחֻמְלָתְךָ עָלֵינוּ תָּנֻן

בְּצִדְקָה נִמְתָּה לֹא אֶ' כִּי 5

בִּי /

¹ So the leading Qaraites of the tenth century, Daniel al Qumisi, Salmon b. Yeruham and Sahl b. Mazliah (see Mann, pp. 51-5 and appropriate Appendices).

² See, e.g. Edward Robertson, "Saadyah Gaon as Translator and Commentator" (*Melilah*, i, pp. 181-4).

³ *Paytānīm*, and Saadyah Gaon amongst them, are known to have used different styles in their different compositions. Suffice it to compare the simple style used by Saadyah in his two *baqqāshōth* (see *Siddur Saadja Gaon*, pp. 47-8) with that used by him in his *'azhārōth* (ibid. pp. 185-216).

⁴ S. Krauss's propounded theory (*Ju. b. Jüd-Liter. Geschichte*, xix(1928), pp. 85-97), that *Kol-Nidrē* was introduced in Palestine as a declaration against Qaraism that attacked the validity of the absolution of vows, is untenable for various reasons (see Mann, p. 53, n. 100). Our suggestion, be it noted, refers only to this particular *qerōbhāh*, in which the importance of *Kol-Nidrē* was demonstrated a few hundred years after *Kol-Nidrē* came into being. For a recent contribution on *Kol-Nidrē* in the Qaraite literature, see H. Leshem, *Davar*, 4.10.57.

⁵ The allusion is to *לצדקה* of Gen. xv. 6. See following three notes.

⁶ = נאמת, "you spoke", "said", a favourite paytanic usage. It occurs on three more occasions in the present *piyyuṭ*, (see lines 39, 44 and 49). It is also used similarly in the Talmudic literature.

⁷ Viz. to Abraham.

⁸ Abb. of אָנֹכִי מִיָּנֵן of Gen. xv. 1.

⁹ The *beth* stands for ברוך. See p. 490.

בְּכָל [] אֲשֶׁר עֵיקְמוֹ ¹	
בְּהֶתֶר גְּדָרִים הִי [] (ז) מו	
בְּטַל יִחְיוּ מִיָּתִיךָ גִּב' יִקוּ ²	
ב"י	10
[וְ]אֲסָרִים	3
גַּם כָּל אֲסָר אֲשֶׁר אֲסָרוּ קְהִילוֹתֶיךָ ³	4
גְּדוֹל' לְגִדְלָהּ יִבְאוּ וּלְחִדּוֹתֶיךָ ⁴	
אֵין קְדוֹשׁ כִּי כִי / אֵין בְּלִתֶּיךָ ⁵	5
ב"י	15

¹ עקם, "to curve", "to wind". Here it implies "not properly done". Cf. last two words of line 2. Note the exaggerated *plena* orthography in the *piyyuṭ* proper. This occurs even in the closing lines of each verse, which are as a rule made up of Biblical passages. Similar *plena* writing is common in the Genizah fragments. Other exaggerated *plena* writings in the present *piyyuṭ* with regard to the *yodh* are in lines 9, 23 (see, however, p. 495, n. 5), 28, 38, 43, 44 (see p. 497, n. 2), 67, 68 and 77, where it indicates the *zere*; lines 13 and 14, where it indicates the *seghol* (the rhyme with the plural קְהִילוֹתֶיךָ of line 12 as well as the *yodh* following its *taw* do not bear out the customary pointing of the pausal form in the second per. masc. as illustrated in pointed *piyyuṭim* up to about 1800; see P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, 1941, p. 96. Cf. however, lines 47-9, where the pointing פִּי holds good); lines 12, 42, 44, 67, 68, 69, 72, 74, and 78, where it indicates the *hireq*, as is the case in line 7; in lines 49 and 62 we find *waws* indicating the *quibbuṣ*. Of another nature is the extra *yodh* in line 62 which indicates the radical. The frame, however, does not follow rigidly the same *plena* system. Cf. line 16 (see p. 495, n. 1) and line 36 (see p. 497, n. 1). On the other hand, words in lines 51 and 61 (see p. 498, n. 11) have *waws* to indicate the *qibbuṣ*. Again, the phenomenon observed in the *piyyuṭ* proper with regard to the extra *yodh* holds good with regard to the first word in line 41 which is non-Biblical. Cf. line 62.

² Abb. וְבִלְתִּי יִקוּמוֹן. The last line, except for בטל, is drawn from Isa. xxvi. 19.

³ See p. 490.

⁴ For the pointing of the suffixed-plural, cf. Num. xxx. 6.

⁵ For the singular, cf. Deut. xxxiii. 4.

⁶ Emblematical form for God. Cf. e.g. Ps. xlviii. 2.

⁷ V-חֲדָה, "rejoice". Cf. Ps. xxi. 7.

⁸ I Sam. ii. 2.

⁹ See p. 490.

ושבעותי

דבר שבועה אם ושבִּעַ¹ / לְהַעֲרִימָה³ 6

דָּגֹל' מְחֹל וְתֵן לְיִזְנָה' תָּמָה'

דַּעַת / וְרו' ח' 7

ב⁶

20

וְהַקְדָּשֹׁתִי

הַפְּרָשֹׁת¹⁰ וְקִיּוּמִים¹¹ / שֶׁהַקְדָּשִׁי¹² חֹלֵת אֶתְּבָה¹³ 8

הַרְטָה¹⁴ וְהַתְעִיל¹⁵ / לְשׁוֹבְכָה¹⁶ 9

הַשִּׁיבֵנו יְיָ אֵלֶיךָ וְנִשְׁוֹבָה¹⁷

ב¹⁸

25

¹ The defective script here tallies with that which occurs in the M.T. in the plural.

² Abb. ושבִּעַנו.

³ Prolonged Infinitive of the Hiph'il. Cf. מערים על השבועה (Cant. Rab. xlix).

⁴ Emblematical term for God. Cf. Ps. xx. 6. See p. 490, n. 4.

⁵ Part of three letters damaged.

⁶ Emblematical expression for Israel. Cf. Cant. v. 2. According to Cant. Rab., the whole of Canticles bears on relations between God and Israel.

⁷ Abb. וְרוֹם חֲכָמָה. The reading is supported by the rhyme. The Biblical passage here, then, is a combination of Ecc. vii. 12 and Isa. xi. 2 and Exod. xxviii. 3. The copyist by mistake placed here the concluding passage of verse 5. This was crossed out and above it the abbreviation was scribbled.

⁸ See p. 490.

⁹ See p. 491f.

¹⁰ V-פרש, (in Post-Biblical Hebrew) "separate". Here "things set apart", as gifts, etc.

¹¹ Here perhaps some sort of established documents.

¹² Qualifying אהבה חולת, which is here an emblematical term for the people of Israel. (See following note as well as p. 490, n. 4). For "people", "nation", treated as plural, cf. e.g. Jud. v. 11; 2 Sam. xviii. 7.

¹³ Cf. Cant. ii. 5.

¹⁴ The Hiph'il of רטה, "to wring out". Here "to heal". See following note.

¹⁵ (Or והתעיל, the 'ayin with *hireq*; see p. 494, n. 1). Secondary Hiph'il from תעלה, "healing" (cf. Jer. xxx. 13). (V-עלה.) Here, a synonym of its preceding word, both of which are favourite coinages in the paytan literature.

¹⁶ Emblematical term for Israel. Cf. Jer. xxxi. 22.

¹⁷ Lam. v. 21. In the manuscript a *yodh* smaller in shape than that of the other *yodhs* is superposed above the word יי, a practice common in the Genizah fragments. This occurs also in lines 14, 34, 69 and 79. My pointing here and in the other instances is in keeping with the traditional pointing of liturgical texts in identical words.

¹⁸ See p. 490.

שְׁנֵדָרְנוֹ /

וְשִׁחַרְמְנוּ¹ לְפָנֶיךָ אֱלִי זֶה² 10וְהֵמֶר נִדְרִים³ / עֲנִיתִינוּ לֹא תִבְזֶה⁴ 11סֶלַח נָא לַעֲוֹן הָעַם הַזֶּה⁵/ ב⁶ 30

שְׁאֲסַרְנוּ לְפָנֶיךָ 12

זֶה אַתָּה אֱלִי⁷זְכוֹר וְהוֹשִׁיעַ⁸ / [מ]בְּלִי וְהֵמֶר כְּבָלִי¹⁰ 13יְיָ צוּרִי וְגֹאֲלִי¹¹/ ב¹² 35

¹ "And which we have banned." For the Qal, cf. *Pirqê R. 'Eli'ezer* 28. Cf. also *Kol-Nidre* as recorded at the end of *Kol Bo*.

² Cf. the reversed order of Exod. xv. 2.

³ Note the crossed out זה which was rewritten here by mistake.

⁴ The meaning of עֲנִיתִינוּ (about its spelling, see p. 494, n. 1) here is of exegetical significance. In Ps. xxii. 25, which obviously inspired the phrase in which this word occurs, עֲנֹת is usually translated "affliction". The difficulty of taking it in this sense in this context was rightly felt by Cheyne. Attaching the צ of its preceding word שָׁקַץ, dropped out by haplography, he suggests the reading צַעֲקָת (see T. K. Cheyne, *J.B.L.* xv. 198). Here it has the obvious meaning of prayer (uttered loudly?), the *piyyuṭ* having been intended for a day when affliction is not practised (see p. 492). The Targum, the LXX and the Vulgate take it in a similar sense, and Mid. Tehillim on Ps. xxii. 25 renders עֲנֹת עֲנִי תַפְלִיתוֹ. See also Rashi and Ibn Ezra. This meaning given to עֲנֹת becomes still clearer in line 74 (see p. 499, n. 13).

⁵ Num. xiv. 19.

⁶ See p. 490.

⁷ A combination of Exod. xv. 2 and Ps. xxii. 11.

⁸ So it appears to have been meant to be read. According to the Tiberian pointing as illustrated in the M.T. we should have here וְהוֹשִׁעַ (cf. e.g. Ps. lxxxvi. 2). A similar form to that of ours is הוֹדִיעַ instead of הוֹדַע (*Piyyuṭê Yannai*, p. 93, line 72). See the note on it by Zulay, who points out that it is not uncommon to find in a *piyyuṭ* the Hiph'il imperative singular with *yodh*, citing הַנִּיחַ instead of הִנַּח (*Rezeh*, Grace After Meal for Sabbath).

⁹ There is a small lacuna in the bosom of the *beth* affecting its roof. The translation of the last two words is "deliver from destruction". Cf. Isa. xxxviii. 17 and note the exegetical significance of the *payṭān*'s phrase.

¹⁰ Cf. Isa. lviii. 6 and Ps. cxlix. 8.

¹¹ Ps. xix. 15.

¹² See p. 490.

שֶׁשֶׁבַעֲנוֹי	14
חָטָא' לֹא תַחֲשׁוּב לְצַמְחֵי רִבְבָה ³	
חֵי' נִקְנוּ מִפֶּשַׁע וּמַחֲוָה ⁶	15
כְּנֻמָּה ⁶ אֶרְפָּא / מְשׁוּכְתָם אוֹהֲבִים וְדָבָה ⁷	16
ב' ⁸	40
שְׁקִימָנוּ [ע]ל / נִפְשִׁי בְשִׁבִי ⁹	17
טַעַם שִׁינוּיָם ¹⁰	
טַהֲרִינוּ מִפֶּשַׁעִים / חֲדָשִׁים גַּם יִשְׁנִים ¹¹	18
לְבַרְכֵינוּ ¹² כְּנֻמָּה ¹³ וְשִׁילֵמָתִי / לָכֶם אֶת הַשְּׁנִים ¹⁴	19
ב' ¹⁵	45
מִיּוֹם רֹאשׁ הַשָּׁ שְׁעִי ¹⁶	
יָדַע קְהֵלָךְ /	
יֹעֲצִי לְהַתֵּר ¹⁷ נִדְרֵיהֶם וּלְחַיֵּלָךְ ¹⁸	20
קִבְצָם כְּנֻמָּה ¹⁹ / אֶסּוּף אֶסּוּף יַעֲקֹב כּוֹלָךְ ²⁰	21
ב' ²¹	50

¹ = נִשְׁבַּעוּ. See p. 492. The same form occurs again, in an abbreviated form, further line 76.

² The *heth* is vocalized. This is the only case of vocalization in the whole of the manuscript.

³ Emblematical term for Israel. Cf. Ezechiel xvi. 7.

⁴ Emblematical term for God. Cf. e.g. Jos. iii. 10 and Isa. xxxvii. 4.

⁵ Here, "sin", "guilt".

⁶ See p. 490, n. 4. כ with the sense of כֹּאשֶׁר attached to the perfect is a favourite paytanic usage. See further lines 44 and 49. For similar anomalies in the Bible, cf. Esther i. 10 and 2 Chron. i. 4. ⁷ Hos. xiv. 5. ⁸ See p. 490.

⁹ Abb. נִפְשִׁנוּ בְּשִׁבּוּעָה

¹⁰ A difficult expression. But perhaps to be metaphorically understood here as "accept favourably (our) prayers" (or "pleadings". Cf. שִׁינוּי סְכוּת . . . (line 72) and see p. 499, n. 12. ¹¹ For the last three words, cf. Cant. vii. 14.

¹² There is a lacuna following the *kaph*. Note that the copyist uses as a rule *yodh* to indicate the *zere* (see p. 494, n. 1).

¹³ See p. 490, n. 4.

¹⁴ Joel ii. 25.

¹⁵ See p. 494, n. 1.

¹⁶ Abb. הִשָּׁה שְׁעֵבֶר . . . (see p. 492). Note that the first *shin* is abridged here; it contains only the right strokes. Similarly, the second *shin* in line 76 and the one in line 81. This is not uncommon in the Genizah material of the tenth to twelfth centuries.

¹⁷ Anomalous spelling of the Infinitive. Cf. however, וְלִהְיֶה, Jer. xlv. 19, 25.

¹⁸ A Pi'el, meaning here "to proclaim you mighty" (for the Qal, cf. Ps. x. 5). It occurs in the Pi'el in this sense often in paytanic literature. Cf. e.g. the *qerôbbah* for the pericope *Pārāh*, beginning with אֲצִילִי עִם.

¹⁹ See p. 490, n. 4.

²⁰ Mic. ii. 12.

²¹ See p. 490.

וְכֹלֵנו תְּזַרְנוּ / כִּם	22
כִּי לָךְ נִדָּה	
כִּי בְּהִמְרִ' נִדְרִים נִתְּנָה	
צִיּוֹן / בְּמִשְׁפָּט תִּפְדֶּה ¹	23
בִּי ²	55
לִפְנֵי אָבִי שֶׁב־	
לְהַתְּנוּדוֹת / וּלְהַשְׁלִיךְ יְהִב־	24
לְהַכְרִיעַ צִדְקָתוֹ בְּאַהֲבָה ³	
לְאַבְד־ ⁴ / שֶׁנֶּאֱמָר לְעֹלֹקָה שְׁתִּי בְּנוֹת הַבִּי	25
בִּי ¹⁰	60
וְכֹלֵהֶם ¹¹ שְׁבִיתִים וּבִטְלִילִים] וּמוֹפְרִים ¹² וְלֹא	26
מִקְרָיִמִים / יָחַד	27
מִלֵּט מִתְּנוּדִים הַיּוֹם מִפֶּחַ וּמִפָּחַד	
הִנֵּה אֵל / יִשׁוּעָתִי אֲבִטַח וְלֹא אֶפְחָד ¹³	28
בִּי ¹⁴	65

¹ A noun on the *haqfel* (or *heqfel*) pattern. Similarly, perhaps, in line 8. Cf. the Talmudic התרת נדרים.

² Isa. i. 27.

³ See p. 490.

⁴ Abb. אָבִינוּ שֶׁבְּשָׁמַיִם.

⁵ Cf. Ps. lv. 23.

⁶ Cf. *Yer. Pe'ah* I, 16b bot.).

⁷ "With love." This segholite sing. form, the plural of which is found in Hos. viii. 9, is a favourite with *payṭānīm*.

⁸ A *he* seems to be superposed between the *lamedh* and the *aleph* and a *yodh* between the *beth* and the *daleth*, thus a Hiph'il instead of the Pi'el was intended.

⁹ Prov. xxx. 15.

¹⁰ See p. 490.

¹¹ This uncontracted form of the suffix is found only in 2 Sam. xxiii. 6 (*Jer.* xv. 10 is a doubtful case; see, however, S. R. Driver, *Book of Samuel*, p. 360). It is possible, however, that we have here the influence of the Aramaic version of *Kol-Nidrê* which reads וְכֹלֵהוֹן. If so, the *he* will perhaps have to be pointed with *holem*. For that reason I have left part of the word unpointed.

¹² The word is damaged, but the reading וּמוֹפְרִים (Hoph'al of פָּרַר, "to frustrate", "break"), not found in the familiar versions of *Kol-Nidrê*, is fairly certain. For the somewhat peculiar shape of the *pe*, cf. that of אֶפְחָד (line 64).

¹³ Isa. xii. 2.

¹⁴ See p. 490.

אם נִדְרֵךְ א' כ' / ל' נִדְרֵךְ

29

בְּקִינוּ מִנִּצִּיחַ

לְמִינוּ בְּצִדְקָה בְּרִיצִיחַ³

חֲזוֹת / כִּי גִיחַם יִי צִיחַ

30

ב'

70

אם חֲרָם ח' []⁸ כ' ח'⁹

סְכוּת¹⁰ סִיחַ¹¹ / שִׁינִי¹²

31

סֶלַח וּמַחֹל לְקַהֵל הַמוֹנִי

עֲנוֹת כִּי לֹא בָזָה וְלֹא / שִׁיקֵץ עֲנוֹת עֲנִי¹³

32

ב'¹⁴

75

¹ Abb. . . . נִדְרֵנוּ אֵין בְּאֵן . . . The stroked *lamedh* which follows is doubtful. It may stand for לשון.

² As far as one can ascertain, it is a newly-coined noun on the pattern of *qittālôn* (a favourite pattern with *paytānîm*. See following note) from the V-נצה, "to quarrel". Here the reference seems to be to legal disputes—to litigations.

³ "With good will", "favour", again a noun on the pattern of *qittālôn*, not recorded in either the Bible or the Talmud. Cf. בריציון . . . אהודנו by Nehemiah b. Hyman Hannasi' in *Studies of the Research Institute for Heb. Poetry*, iv. 220, line 17. For נחניו בצדקך, cf. Isa. v. 9.

⁴ Infinitive, expressing a wish.

⁵ Isa. li. 3.

⁶ See p. 490.

⁷ Abb. חֲרָמִינוּ.

⁸ The diffused word looks like the reading כל. An א (abb. for אֵין), however, is obviously expected here, as is evidenced from the link of the *Kol-Nidrê* frame of its preceding verse.

⁹ Abb. בְּאֵן חֲרָם . . .

¹⁰ In the sense given to it in the Hiph'il of Biblical Hebrew its meaning is "listen". The Qal is a favourite with *paytānîm*. For the Niph'al, cf. Ben Sira (ed. M. Z. Segal, Jerusalem, 1953), xiii, 23, p. 82).

¹¹ = שִׁיחַ.

¹² See p. 497, n. 10. Cf. R. Suliman's רחשם יערב וסיה פלולם (*Ginzê Schechter*, iii, 127, 27).

¹³ Ps. xxii. 25. According to the *paytān*, עֲנוֹת of this Biblical passage undoubtedly means "prayer", since it bears on the Benediction which concludes with the words שומע תפלה . . . ברוך (see p. 490. See also p. 496, n. 4.).

¹⁴ See p. 490.

אם שבו' הש' א' כ' ש'¹

לַעֲנוֹת מַחֶה / מִקְהֵל וְעִידָה 33

לַעֲנֶה עִם אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדַי הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה
וְעָרְבָה / לִי מִנַּחַת יְהוּדָה² 34

ב'³ 80

א' כ' ל' נָד' ו' ח'⁴ וְלֹא ש'⁵
פְּנִיָּה⁷ [] בְּצִבְיֹן⁸ 35

פָּאֵר בִּישַׁע⁹ עֻוְתָנוּ¹⁰ [] יִן
טוֹב לָהּ[וֹדוֹת לִי וְלִמָּר / לְשִׁמְךָ עֲלִיּוֹן¹¹ 36

ב'¹² 85

יֵשׁ כֵּאֵן [מְחִילָה ס'] לַיְחָה

[הָעָם /

וְנִסְלַח לְכָל עֲדַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל¹³] 37

יֵשׁ[או / [הָרִים שְׁלוֹם לְעַם¹⁴ 38

ב'¹⁵ 90

¹ Abb. שְׁבוּעָה הַשְּׁבַעֲנוּ אֵין כֵּאֵן שְׁבוּעָה. . . Note the abridged *shin* in the second word. (See p. 497, n. 16). For the form שְׁהַשְּׁבַעֲנוּ, see p. 492.

² Mal. iii. 4.

³ See p. 490.

⁴ Abb. . . . אֵין כֵּאֵן לֹא נָדָר וְלֹא.

⁵ Letter diffused, but likely to be *heth* which stands as an abbreviation for חֶרֶם.

⁶ Abb. שְׁבוּעָה. As regards the shape of *shin*, see p. 497, n. 16.

⁷ Word heavily diffused and *nun* damaged.

⁸ "In desire", "in pleasure" (cf. e.g. Keth. 111a). Cf. the Aramaic and the Syriac צִבְיָא.

⁹ Cf. Ps. cxlix. 4.

¹⁰ "Our perversion" (cf. Ab. v. 8) but word diffused and doubtful.

¹¹ Ps. xcii. 2.

¹² See p. 490.

¹³ Num. xv. 26.

¹⁴ Ps. lxxii. 3.

¹⁵ See p. 490.

A LORD MAYOR'S SHOW BY JOHN TAYLOR, THE WATER POET

By SHEILA WILLIAMS, M.A., Ph.D.
LECTURER IN ENGLISH, JEWS' COLLEGE, LONDON

IN the John Rylands Library¹ is a small pamphlet whose title page runs :

THE / TRIVMPHS / OF / FAME and HONOVVR : / OR /
THE NOBLE AC- / complish'd solemnity, full of Cost,
Art / and state, at the Inauguration and Establish- / ment
of the true worthy and right nobly min- / ded *ROBERT
PARKHVRST*, into the Right / Honourable office of
Lord *Maior* of / LONDON. / The particularities of every /
Invention in all the Pageants, Shewes and / Triumphs
both by Water and Land, are here / following fully set
downe, being all performed / by the Loves, Liberall Costs,
and charges / of the Right Worshipfull and worthy Bro- /
therhood of the Clothworkers the 29 / of October 1634. /
Written by *John Taylor*. / [Ornamented line] / Imprinted at
London 1634.

In this pamphlet John Taylor describes the Lord Mayor's Show of 1634.

In the seventeenth century the Lord Mayor's Show was normally held every year, as it is today. It took place on 29 October instead of the present 9 November. The Lord Mayor was drawn from one of the twelve "great" Livery Companies of London, the Mercers', Grocers', Drapers', Fishmongers', Goldsmiths', Skinners', Merchant Taylors', Haberdashers', Salters', Ironmongers', Vintners', and Clothworkers' Companies. The Company of which the Lord Mayor was a member organized and paid for the Show. *FAME and HONOVVR* is a Clothworkers' Show.

The Lord Mayor's Show is no doubt still the greatest public

¹ Pressmark 10176. 1.

event in the life of the City of London, but the immense procession is less complex and interesting than it was 200 years ago. Already then, especially after the Restoration, there were wits¹ who sneered at the Show for being pretentious, though they, in company with the rest of London, continued to go to see it. In fact, it was, even in the seventeenth century, something of an anachronism. The golden age of Renaissance open-air festivities with their towers, temples, and triumphal arches, with their allegorical and mythological personages, was drawing to a close as the Lord Mayor's Show of London was reaching its perhaps over-ripe maturity. There had probably been a procession on Lord Mayor's Day since the end of the twelfth century, when the Commune of London was established.² From then on the mayor had to go annually to Westminster to take his oath to the king, and he was accompanied on his journey by music and other signs of festivity.³ Sometime in the fifteenth century it became the custom for the mayor to go by barge up the river to Westminster and to return the same way;⁴ the procession by land covered only the short stretch from the Guildhall to the riverside and, after the oath had been taken, back again. The journey on the Thames was regarded as part of the triumphal progress, and by the time of Henry VIII's marriage with Anne Boleyn⁵ the mayoral festivities by water were well established. But there were no pageants; the celebrations by land and water consisted of music and gunfire. London civic pageantry was principally represented from about 1500 to 1540 by the Midsummer Show, whose splendours possibly delayed the development of the Lord Mayor's Show. Since the same civic bodies would have to pay for both Shows, there was perhaps some reluctance to undertake a second one; and June was a far more suitable month than

¹ S. Pepys, *Diary*, ed. H. B. Wheatley and Braybrooke, 10 vols. (1903-4), iii. 322; N. Ward, *The London-Spy Compleat*, 2 vols. (1706), I, pt. xii, 293-8.

² J. H. Round, *The Commune of London* (1899), pp. 224-5; H. B. Wheatley, "London Government", *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1910).

³ J. A. Kingdom, *Facsimile of the First Volume of the MS. Archives of the Worshipful Company of Grocers*, 2 pts. (1886), pt. i, p. 91; pt. ii, pp. 235 and 237.

⁴ R. Withington, *English Pageantry*, 2 vols. (1918-20), ii. 6-9.

⁵ E. Halle, *Chronicle (The Vnion of the two . . . famelies)* (1548), fol. ccxii (v).

October for out-of-door pageants. However, in 1535 and 1540 pageants from the Midsummer Shows were used again for the mayoral inauguration,¹ and soon afterwards pageantry on Lord Mayor's Day became the rule rather than the exception.²

From being a single pageant on land the Lord Mayor's Show gradually came to include a whole series of pageants by river and by land. This process was complete by about 1612. From then for nearly a century the Show was, in size and complexity, at its most imposing. Early in the morning the members of the Livery Companies of London met outside the Guildhall and processed to the riverside, where the chief men of all the major Companies boarded their barges for Westminster. The Lord Mayor's barge went first, his own Company's next, and the other Companies' barges followed in their order. This order of precedence was sometimes taken unexpectedly lightly. A Drapers' Company manuscript records that in 1638, when one of their men was Lord Mayor, they gave extra drinking money to their bargemen for

outrowing the Lord Maiors Barge and landing the Company before the Lord Maior and Aldermen were landed (the Lord Maiors Barge being allmost out of sight rowing towards Westminster before our Company tooke water).³

On the return journey the entertainment began. There was always a gally foist from which salutes of guns were fired. This very primitive form of honouring the occasion had little appeal for the devisers of the pageantry proper. Thomas Dekker, describing the Show of 1612, refused to give an account of such things on the grounds that

Apollo hauing no hand in them, I suffer them to dye by that which fed them ; that is to say, *Powder & Smoake*. Their thunder (according to the old *Gally-foyst-fashion*) was too lowd for any of the *Nine Muses* to be bidden to it.⁴

¹ Malone Society, *Collections*, vol. iii (*A Calendar of Dramatic Records in the Books of the Livery Companies of London* (1485-1640) (1954)), p. 37.

² H. Machyn, *Diary*, B. M. Cottonian MS. Vitellius F5, indicates that Lord Mayors' Shows took place nearly every year between 1553 and 1562. Mal. Soc., *Coll.* iii, 37-54, includes extracts from manuscripts in the possession of the Twelve "Great" Livery Companies of London showing the existence of Lord Mayors' Pageants for many other years between 1543 and 1584.

³ Drapers' Hall MS. + 178 (1638), fol. 88.

⁴ T. Dekker, *Troia-Noua Triumphans* (1612), sig. D.^v

The pageants of the Show, whether by land or water, took most of the varied forms of Renaissance pageantry. There were ships, islands, temples, bowers, wildernesses, towers, triumphal arches ; there were also, more realistically, shops, trading ships and plantations. The figures in these scenes were mostly living, and represented persons from allegory and history and myth and contemporary life. As a rule the themes of these tableaux were relevant to the affairs of the City. When the procession formed again after the disembarkation of the principal citizens, it was arranged in ascending order of importance, so that everyone else, spectators and members of the procession alike, had seen the devices by the time the Lord Mayor came to them. On his arrival the scenes came to life. The allegory or history of the tableaux was sometimes easy to understand, sometimes difficult ; but in any case a spoken interpretation was usually given (except for the water pageants) by one of the personages. Thus the tableaux were three-dimensional emblems closely related to the two-dimensional ones of the popular emblem-books. Even when the prevailing verse fashion was blank verse, these speeches were nearly always in couplets of iambic pentameter. Songs, dances, or acrobatics also formed part of some tableaux. The pageants of the Lord Mayor's Show, following the practice of the Midsummer Show, were built to be carried by porters or drawn by horses ; and each, after it had been observed by the Lord Mayor, joined in the procession behind his group. Thus the whole Show arrived at the Guildhall, where the important people attended the Lord Mayor's Banquet. Before the Great Fire a special inaugural service was held in St. Paul's Cathedral and the whole Show came out again to escort the Lord Mayor back along Cheapside to the Cathedral. If the night was fine, this was the most romantic part of the ceremonies. One writer compared the Show at night to a wedding masque, for

Euening hastening on speedily . . . darknesse becommeth like bright day, by bountifull allowance of lighted Torches . . . The order of march appeared . . . excellent and commendable, euen as if it had been a Royall Maske, prepared for the marriage of an immortal Deitie.¹

After the service, the Lord Mayor was escorted to his home,

¹ A. Munday, *Metropolis Coronate* (1615), sig. B4^v.

which served also as his official residence till 1732, when the Mansion House was built. There he was often greeted by a simple pageant.

A Show characterized by devices in which myth, allegory, and history played a prominent part, and by interpretative verse speeches and dialogues, required the services of a pageant-poet. The pageant-poets with whom Taylor was more or less contemporary included Peele, Dekker, Middleton, Munday, and Thomas Heywood; all these devised several Shows. Ben Jonson,¹ who devised the Show in 1604, and John Webster,² who devised it in 1624, were each responsible for one Show. There was clearly a tendency to reappoint a man who had proved himself satisfactory on a previous occasion. Thus Dekker was employed in 1627, 1628, and 1629.³ In 1630 there were no pageants, but the Merchants Taylors' Company paid a pound to Dekker

for his service offered to the Companie if any Pageants had been made.⁴

FAME and HONOUR was the only Show of the sixteen-thirties not devised by Heywood.

Why should Taylor have replaced Heywood for this single Show? One possible explanation lies in Heywood's defection. In the autumn of 1634 Heywood reached the summit of his career with his masque *Loves Maistresse*, which was presented before the King and Queen three times in eight days.⁵ Thus having risen from bourgeois to Court spectacle, Heywood may

¹ Haberdashers' Hall, MS. *The Yeomanry Account for the Lord Mayor's Triumph* (1604).

² J. Webster, *Monuments of Honor* (1624), is known only in the copy in the Henry E. Huntington Library, California, U.S.A. A photostatic copy is in R.T.D. Sayle, *Lord Mayors' Pageants of the Merchant Taylors' Company in the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries* (1931), between pp. 116 and 117.

³ No records of the 1627 Show remain. It is inferred to have taken place from remarks made by Dekker in *Warres, Warres, Warres* (1628) (unique copy: Hunt. Lib.; photostat, Bodleian). That pamphlet is dedicated to Hugh Hammersley, Lord Mayor, and Dekker says that "It was some ioy to me, to bee employed in the Praesentation of your Triumphs, on the day of your Lordships Inauguration" (sig. A2v/A3). Dekker's pamphlet of 1628 is *Britannia's Honor* and of 1629 *Londons Tempe*.

⁴ Mal. Soc., Coll. iii. 120.

⁵ T. Heywood, *Loves Maistresse* (1636), title-page. For the dating of the royal performances of *Loves Maistresse* see A. M. Clark, *Thomas Heywood* (1631), pp. 129-31.

have declined to divide his energies. Taylor and he had been long acquainted,¹ and it is possible that he suggested Taylor as pageant-poet.

On the other hand Heywood seems to have played only a subordinate part in the Shows with which he was associated. At one extreme, a poet was necessary to write the verses ; at the other, a carpenter-painter was necessary to build the floats. But all sorts of compromises were possible with regard to general direction, choice of the content of the pageants, and so on. Sometimes the poet's was the guiding brain. George Peele is said to have had "all the oversight of the Pageants",² and the dominating Middleton assumed the whole direction of the Show in 1617.³ But by the 1630s the position was very different. Garret Christmas, a reputable craftsman in wood and stone, had been assistant or principal "artificer" for the Shows since 1618.⁴ With Middleton and Dekker Christmas worked in an equal partnership ;⁵ this itself was a tribute to his abilities and forcefulness. The contract for the Show of 1629, the last before Heywood became pageant-poet, was signed by both Dekker and Christmas.⁶ But in 1631 and 1632 money for pageants and shows was paid only to Garret Christmas ; Heywood was not so much as mentioned.⁷ Now Garret Christmas died in 1634, and it was probably his death, not Heywood's masque, which left the field free for competitors. There is a hint of this in Taylor's remark that *FAME and HONOUR*

being gracefully accepted & approved of, after good CHRISTMAS, the authors may be the more merry at the next.⁸

Unfortunately the records of the Clothworkers' Company are lost, so that it is impossible to tell whether Taylor and his

¹ J. Taylor wrote commendatory verses for Heywood's *An Apology for Actors* (1612).

² G. Peele, *Merrie Conceited Iests* (1627), p. 7.

³ Grocers' Hall MS. 117 (*Charges of Triumph*) (1617), fol. 14^v.

⁴ Mal. Soc., *Coll.* iii. 97 and 98.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 101, 105, 110, 113(?), 114.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 115.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 121, 122.

⁸ *Fame*, sig. B4.

"artificer" met with any competition. Certainly the next year, 1635, the team entered the field again with a project of five pageants to cost £190; but they were undercut by £10 by the project of Garret Christmas's sons, John and Matthias, and Thomas Heywood. The contract was signed by the Christmas brothers only.¹ The Show of 1634 remained Taylor's sole effort in mayoral pageantry. According to *FAME and HONOUR* his "artificer" was one Robert Norman, "Citizen and Painter of London". Nothing is known of this Norman except that he assisted Garret Christmas in preparing *Britannia's Honor* in 1628.² He had, therefore, neither the reputation nor the experience of Christmas. Taylor gives a fairly detailed account of his relations with his "artificer":

It were shamefull impudence in mee to assume the invention of these Structures and Architectures to my selfe, they being busines which I never was inured in, or acquainted with all, there being little of my directions in these shewes; onely the Speeches, and Illustrations which are here printed I doe justly challenge as mine owne, all the rest of the Composures and Fabricks were formed and framed by the ingenious and industrious Mr. *Robert Norman* Citizen and Painter of London, who was indeed the prime inventor prosecutor and finisher of these works, with the assistance of *Zachary Taylor* a quaint and well knowne curious Carver, which being gracefully accepted & approved of, after good CHRISTMAS, the authors may be the more merry at the next.³

From this it seems that Taylor was very decidedly the junior partner. The vital part of the Show, in the sense that all the other parts followed from it and could not come into being without it, was the "invention", or

the finding out or selection of topics to be treated, or arguments to be used.⁴

It might be held that in disclaiming "the invention of these Structures and Architectures" Taylor was referring only to planning the floats. But all he claims for himself is "the Speeches, and Illustrations which are here printed". One contemporary meaning of "illustration" was "elucidation, explanation".⁵ By

a figure called Illustration, . . . the forme of things is so set foorth in words, that it seemeth rather to be seene with the eies, then heard with the eares.⁶

¹ Mal. Soc., Coll. iii. p. 125.

² Ibid. p. 113.

³ *Fame*, sig. B4.

⁴ *N.E.D.*

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ J. Marbeck, *A Booke of Notes* (1581), p. 491.

This exactly describes what Taylor was attempting to do in the prose part of the pamphlet, and the "Speeches" he claims cover the rest. Further, in his title page he makes no claim to "inventing" or "devising" the Show. In his second pageant he refers to Mercury as the patron of the artificer's "Invention" but of the poet's "Eloquence". This indicates definitely that Norman rather than Taylor was responsible for the ideas expressed in the Show.¹

This question of the relationship of poet and "artificer" is particularly interesting since an inability to achieve a satisfactory balance of functions in the masque, a form precisely parallel in this respect, broke up the most celebrated partnership of the period. The quarrel between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones centred on this question of the "invention".² The stages of the quarrel, during which Jonson gradually lost control over this vital initial process, are reflected in the history of poet and "artificer" in the lowlier Lord Mayor's Show. Peele, Jonson, and at first Middleton³ were the prime movers in the Show. But the talented Garret Christmas established himself as an equal partner with Middleton and Dekker, and quite dominated Heywood. Taylor, coming new to the Show and in any case less talented than most of his predecessors, adopted Heywood's subordinate position without protest, just as Heywood continued in his subordinate position when he worked with Inigo Jones in *Loves Maistresse*.⁴ Indeed the situation is very similar; but the attitude of the poets is quite different. Whereas Ben Jonson objected in every way he could to the gradual cutting away of his part, Heywood⁵ and Taylor regarded themselves,

¹ *Fame*, sigs. A6-A7. Cf. p. 520.

² See D. J. Gordon, "Poet and Architect: The Intellectual Setting of the Quarrel between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, xii (1949), 154-61.

³ For Peele and Middleton see above p. 506. For Jonson, the wording of the Haberdashers' accounts makes it clear that the invention was his: "Beniamyn Johnson" was paid "for his device, and speech for the Children" (Haberdashers' Hall MS. *Yeomenry Account* (1604)).

⁴ T. Heywood, *Loves Maistresse*, title-page, and sig. A2^v.

⁵ For an example of the eulogies by which Heywood indicated his satisfaction at the relations existing between himself and Christmas in the matter of the Lord Mayor's Shows, see T. Heywood, "Londini Artium & Scientiarum Scaturigo", reprinted in *Theatre Miscellany* (1953), p. 45.

without any sign of chagrin, as mere librettists and chroniclers. But in these circumstances, to refer to the devices of *FAME* and *HONOUR* as Taylor's is more a matter of convenience than of accuracy.

The one aspect of the Show for which Taylor was solely responsible was his descriptive pamphlet, *FAME* and *HONOUR*. At least from 1585, when George Peele wrote *THE DEVICE of the Pageant borne before Sir Woolstan Dixi*, to 1702, when Elkanah Settle wrote *The Triumphs of London* in celebration of the mayoralty of Sir Samuel Dashwood, it was customary to issue a printed account of the Show, written by the poet who had devised the speeches and perhaps the pageantry. These pamphlets are very rare. Most of those probably issued between 1585 and 1612 have disappeared altogether. Taylor's pamphlet survives only, so far as is known, in the John Rylands copy. *THE / TRIUMPHS / OF / FAME* and *HONOUR* is an unpaginated octavo, running from A to B6; it was originally unbound. The margins are cropped. Taylor's title is fairly typical: it demonstrates, as did most, the honour and glory of the city for which the pageants were devised. There is perhaps a hint of Middleton's influence, since he was the only previous pageant-poet who frequently used titles in this form.¹

The pamphlets were records of the day's proceedings, but they may have been programmes or souvenirs, and distributed or sold to spectators or Company members. The pamphlets themselves, the Stationers' Register, and the surviving manuscript accounts for the Shows, tell something but not everything. The organizing Company usually bought a certain number of books from the poet,² who was most often responsible for overseeing the printing.³ In the sixteen-thirties the Companies ordered three⁴ or five⁵ hundred copies, and once, in 1638, extra

¹ *The Triumphs of Truth* (1613); *The Tryumphs of Honor and Industry* (1617); *The Triumphs of Loue and Antiquity* (1619); *The Triumphs of Honor and Vertue* (1622); *The Triumphs of Integrity* (1623); *The Triumphs of Health and Prosperity* (1626). Of Shows by other writers, cf. only A. Munday, *The Triumphs of reunited Britania* (1605) and *The Triumphs of the Golden Fleece* (1623).

² Mal. Soc., Coll. iii. 59 (1602), 63 (1604), 68-9 (1605), 85 (1612), 91 (1616), 104 (1622), 115 (1629).

³ There are exceptions to this. See Mal. Soc., Coll. pp. 87 (1613), 92 (1617).

⁴ Mal. Soc., Coll. pp. 121 and 127 (300 copies).

⁵ Ibid. pp. 123 and 127 (500 copies).

copies were required.¹ These booklets were presumably given to Company members. As the poet saw the books through the press there was nothing to prevent him, if he chose, from having more copies printed and trying to sell them. There is no direct evidence about this for any pamphlets before the Civil War. After the Restoration the titles of several pamphlets bore the words "to be sold",² and once the price was stated—sixpence.³ Presumably, therefore, at least these pamphlets, and quite possibly others, were sold to the public. Even after the Restoration the printing must have been done in a great hurry if the pamphlets were to be ready for 29 October, since the usual date for Stationers' Register entries was 26 October.⁴ Such pre-Civil War pamphlets as appear in the Register were, with one exception, entered so late that they could not possibly be printed in time,⁵ and at least one pamphlet was not completed till after the Show had taken place.⁶ The exception is Taylor's own pamphlet, which was entered as early as 14 October 1634:

Henry Gosson. / Entred for his Copy, the *Booke of the Lord Mayours Show of this yeare 1634.* by Master / John TAYLOR.

This entry does not prove that Taylor managed to find a way to raise extra money from his association with the Lord Mayor's Show, but it does suggest something of the kind. Such ingenuity would be in keeping with Taylor's unorthodox financial enterprise.

Because of the confused and variable relationship between the poets and the "artificers", it is exceedingly difficult to calculate

¹ Mal. Soc., *Coll.* p. 127.

² T. Jordan, *The Triumphs of London* (1675), *The Triumphs of London* (1683); M. Taubman, *London's Anniversary Festival* (1688); E. Settle, *The Triumphs of London* (1692, 1693, 1694, 1695), *Glory's Resurrection* (1698), *The Triumphs of London* (1708).

³ E. Settle, *Glory's Resurrection* (1698).

⁴ Very few pamphlets were entered into the Stationers' Register at all. Those of 1660, 1674, 1683 were entered on 26 October.

⁵ Peele's lost pamphlet of 1588 was entered 28 October; T. Middleton's *Truth*, 1613, was entered 3 November; A. Munday's *Chrysanaleia*, 1616, was entered 29 October; for T. Dekker, *Troia-Noua*, 1612, entered 21 October, see note 6 below.

⁶ T. Dekker, *Troia-Noua*, was entered 21 October, but only "to be prynted when yt is further Authourised". In fact *Troia-Noua* was not printed till after the Show had taken place. See sig. D^o, quoted above, p. 503.

how much the poet was usually paid for his own proper work. If the poet were the master, as Middleton was in 1617,¹ he was paid for the carpentry and painting too. When the poet was subordinate, as Heywood and Taylor were,² he was paid by the "artificer". And in any case the Clothworkers' records are lost. The only clear example before the Civil War of the poet being paid solely for his proper work was in 1604, when Ben Jonson was paid £12

for his device, and speech for the Children.³

After the Restoration the poet was sometimes paid separately. Thomas Jordan, for instance, received about £12 for each of the Drapers' Shows with which he was associated.⁴ Perhaps Taylor received about the same fee.

Taylor's pamphlet, *THE / TRIVMPHS / OF / FAME and HONOUR*, opens with a dedication⁵ to the Clothworker Lord Mayor, Sir Robert Parkhurst, which contains some verses very complimentary to both Lord Mayor and King :

. . . *London in these Triumphs is renownd
Above all cities in the worlds wide Round :
For no Kings Deputy, or Magistrate
Is with such pompous state inaugurate,
As Londons Mayor is, which most plainly shoves
The Kings illustrious greatnesse whence it flows . . .*

The dedication is followed by a detailed description, which occupies the bulk of the pamphlet, of the six pageants of the Show. First comes a prose account of the structure and personages of each pageant, and then there follows the speech delivered in connection with it. These descriptions are followed by "explanations" of the first three pageants. The "explanations" cease there, as if Taylor tired of his work of supererogation. No other mayoral pageant-poet attempted to help his readers in this way, yet there is considerable evidence that help was needed. Thirty years earlier Ben Jonson and

¹ Grocers' Hall MS. 117, fol. 14^v.

² See above, pp. 506-9.

³ Haberdashers' Hall MS. *The Yeomanry account* (1604).

⁴ Drapers' Hall MS. + 178, fols. 145 (1675), 151 (1676), 156 (1679), 163 (1684).

⁵ *Fame*, sigs. A3-A4.

Dekker had been employed to devise pageants for King James's entry into London in 1604.¹ The pageantry of this entertainment was rather more complex than that of the Lord Mayor's Show, but in the same tradition, and was presented before an even wider audience. Dekker and Johnson disagreed about the proper attitude to spectators. Johnson held that open-air pageants ought not to require

one to write, *This is a Dog* : or, *This is a Hare* : but so to be presented, as vpon the view they might without cloude, or obscurity declare themselves to the sharpe and learned : And for the multitude, no doubt but their grounded iudgements gazed, said it was fine, and were satisfied.²

Dekker on the contrary held that the creators of the pageants should consider the unlettered majority rather than the learned minority, which included the learned king in whose honour the pageants were framed. The multitude, said Dekker,

is now to be our Audience, whose heads would miserably runne a wool-gathering, if we doo but offer to breake them with hard words.³

Both writers plainly believed the understanding of the common people to be very limited, though Jonson, apparently, was referring to the allegory in general and Dekker to the speeches in particular. Whatever his views, Dekker gave no special help to his audience when he was responsible for the Lord Mayors' Shows of 1612, 1628, and 1629.⁴ John Webster appended an apologetic note to *Monuments of Honour* that

I could, a more curious and Elaborate way haue exprest my selfe in these my endeauors, but . . . might haue troubled my Noble Lord, and pusled the vnderstanding of the Common People.⁵

Webster's Show was nevertheless elaborate, and it is very doubtful if "the Common People" could interpret it at sight. Of all the pageant-poets, Taylor was nearest the ordinary man himself, and perhaps had the most accurate understanding of his limitations. His "explanations", however, are more concerned with the "hard words" Dekker objected to than

¹ B. Jonson described his pageants in *His Part of King James his Royall and Magnificent Entertainment* (1604) ; and Dekker his in *The Magnificent Entertainment* (1604).

² B. Jonson, *His Part*, sig. B2.

³ T. Dekker, *Magnificent Entertainment*, sig. A4^v.

⁴ T. Dekker, *Troia-Noua, Britannia's Honor, Londons Tempe*.

⁵ J. Webster, *Honor*, sig. C2^v.

with the allegory that Jonson assumed the crowd would not be able to interpret, and reflect his own interest in historical and geographical curiosities. Taylor says himself that he wishes to elucidate such words and places as may seeme hard and obscure to some meane Readers.

The first device,¹ a river show, met the Lord Mayor on his return from Westminster and escorted him for the last lap of the journey. It was a

Barge, adorned with the armes and Impresses of the honourable Citie and Company, with seeming properties of being loaden, with Packs, dryfats, and divers other commodities, that marchants and others that are free of the Company of Clothworkers, doe receive from foreigne parts by sea.

Thetis and Thamesis sat in the prow of this barge. Thetis was dressed in a sea-green mantle,

with a coronet of shels of divers sorts of sea-fish on her head with a great whelk-fish in her hand with adornments of strange fishes and other significant representations.

Thamesis wore a white robe, and was crowned with a chaplet of green reeds, flowers, and rushes, and around her feet were sedge, bulrushes, and flags. Thetis delivered a speech interpreting this pageant :

I every twelve houres, by this Child of mine,
Do send you silks and velvets, oyle, and wine,
Gold, silver, Jewels, fish salt, sundry spices,
Fine and course linenn, druggs of divers prices :
What every Realme or climate can produce,
I see it safe transported for your use.
Thus from the bosome of the Deepe my floods
(By Thames) doe every Tyde send up your goods,
For which this matchlesse well deserving River,
Your Cloth doth backe againe to me deliver,
With other riches, which I o're the Sea
Unto my other daughters doe convey ;
For your commodities I'le ever flow
Unto Danubius, Ister, Rhine, and Poe,
[here follows a versified list of rivers]
. . . So far will I your servant ever be,
In any thing you'l deigne to put on me :
And humble thanks faire Thames and I doe render
To you, who of her well-fare are so tender,
Who with great cost and care doe lend your hands,
To clear your servant Thames from shelves and sands :
Go on and cleanse her, as you have begun,
And she shall doe for you as she hath done . . .

¹ *Fame*, sigs. A5-6.

Then the Rowers (consisting of foure in number, being two Saylours, two watermen) being ouer-joyed, pike their oares, and every of them drinks his Kan as a health, tossing them up, and presently falling into a Rugged friskin daunce, returne to *Pauls wharfe*, and landing the said Barge, she is carried as the formost Pageant in the shew through the Citie.

This opening pageant introduces several of the Show's themes: the City, the Clothworkers' Company, and the Lord Mayor, all of whom Taylor wished to please. As befitted a great river port, one of the pageant's personages, Thetis, represented the sea, and one, Thamesis, the river. Thetis, the daughter of Nereus, whose empire was the Mediterranean and more particularly the Adriatic, was not altogether suited to our northern seas. Taylor was perfectly aware of her exclusively southern associations, and indeed gives an account of them in his "explanation of the first Pageant of Thetis". A more meticulous pageant-poet¹ might have rejected Thetis on the grounds of inappropriateness, but the mayoral pageant-poets were engaged in the difficult task of trying to use in an unlearned commercial context the apparatus of classical myth and allegory which an aristocratic Renaissance culture had made more or less obligatory in public festivities. Neptune himself was, after all, originally a Mediterranean deity.

Taylor's individual handling is evident in several aspects of this pageant. The commercial note is unusually candid, even gauche. The opening lines of the verses, building up to "druggs of divers prices", read like an advertiser's list. The verse of the Lord Mayor's Shows is almost never distinguished, but Taylor's has at times a specially homespun quality. His professional connection with the river appears in his concern for the dredging and cleansing of the Thames. This had been an earlier theme of his. In *TAYLOR on Thame Isis*, 1632, he devoted nearly half his space to describing faults in the Thames waterway, which prevented watermen from plying their craft with the skill and success it deserved. But he had few complaints to make about the stretch of river under the control of the Lord Mayor. On the Thames, he said, depended much of England's life; and,

¹ But J. Webster, *Honor*, sigs. A3^v-A4^v, also used Thetis.

for the good to *England* it hath done,
 Shall it to spoyle and ruine be let runne?
 Shall priuate persons for their gainfull use,
 Ingrosse the water and the land abuse,
 Shall that which God and nature giues us free,
 For vse and profit in community,
 Be barr'd from men, and damb'd vp as in *Thames*.
 (A shamelesse auarice surpassing shames :)
 I speake not of the riuers bounds below,
 Whereas the tides perpetuall ebbe and flow,
 Nor is the river wanting much repaire,
 Within the bounds of *Londons* honour'd Maior,
 Which limits all are clear from stakes and piles,
 Beyond *Stanes* bridge (thats more than forty miles).¹

But if Taylor had abstained from criticizing the condition of the river by London itself, others complained that the Thames was being allowed to silt up, and it was in this year, 1634, that at last rules and regulations of conservancy, for keeping the river clear and open, were made.²

Taylor the waterman appears again in the clear distinction he makes between river and sea, a distinction which emerges both in the pageant and in the dance of two sailors and two watermen which follows it. There had been dances in mayoral pageantry before, but they were not very common. Similarly there had been occasional comic devices before, but they were not of much importance in the Shows in which they appeared. Light relief from allegory and history was usually provided in Heywood's later Shows by tumbling and acrobatics. The light-hearted, jolly, comic device of the "Rugged, friskin daunce" of the Lord Mayor's Show foreshadows the later development. Tatham, in the first Restoration Show, took up the idea with further elaboration when he had rustics speak in dialect and dance round an oak tree representing the tree in which Charles II hid during his famous escape from Worcester.³ Thereafter the best of the Lord Mayors' Shows were mainly a mixed light entertainment. There is no reason, however, to suppose that later mayoral poets were consciously following in Taylor's footsteps.

¹ J. Taylor, *Taylor on Thames Ises* (1632), sig. B^v-B2.

² H. Humpherus, *History of the Origin and Progress of the Company of Watermen and Lightermen of the River Thames*, 3 vols. (1859), ii. 226.

³ J. Tatham, *The Royall Oake* (1660), [pp. 10-11.]

In his prose description of the pageant, Taylor remarks that the barge appeared again later on land. This is not an example of particular parsimoniousness on the part of the organizers of the 1634 Show. It was the custom for pageant-poets to make the most of their devices, and such double use happened not only in mayoral pageantry¹ but also in royal festivities if these took place partly on the river.²

After seeing this pageant on the river, the mayor and his entourage and the chief men of the Companies disembarked from their barges and were rejoined by the rest of the procession. They then all processed, in ascending order of importance, towards St. Paul's. In the Churchyard they were met by the second pageant.³ Time and Mercury were mounted on two griffins. Time had his scythe, and Mercury bore his charming rod, and had wings on his head and feet. Time was the speaker to the pageant. He rejoiced in the antiquity of the Shows. There have been five hundred of them, he says, and most Lord Mayors have graced their office. So

Time hopes that th' addition of your yeare,
Will make him more Illustrate, pure and cleare.
For of all fading things 'tis manifest,
As *Time* is us'd, hee's either worst or best.
All those that rightly have their Honours won :
Have us'd *Time* well, (as you my Lord Have done.)
This Honour was ordaind you, from your youth
You ever lov'd my loveliest daughter TRVTH,
And she hath rais'd you ; and she did prefer
You to this dignity to maintaine her,
I doe command her, still with you t'abide,
Doe you defend her, she shall be your guide :
For truth-sake *Time* shall be your servant still ;
And in your just commands, obey your will.
Time shall transport your Marchandise and wares,
Time shall assist you in your great'st affaires :
Time shall be alwaies yours Auspiciously,
And *Time* will bring you to Eternity.

Mercury is said in the prose description of the tableaux to be one of the speakers. In fact he is not, but the words referring to him, under his Greek name of Hermes, are of interest :

¹ E.g. T. Middleton, *Truth*, sig. B4^v.

² E. Halle, *Vnion*, fols. ccxiii and ccxiii^v.

³ *Fame*, sigs. A6-A7.

Her's *Hermes*, from his Spheares circumference
 Hath brought the Poet wit, and Eloquence ;
 And quick Invention, likewise he Inflame'd
 Into the Artists that these pageants fram'd,
 That for your future Honour, this may be
 A day of well Compos'd Variety
 Of Speach and shew, these Triumphs we present,
 We hope (as they are meant shall give content)
 We humbly wish, that you this yeare may finde,
 Full of true worth as is your worthy mind.

The arms of the Clothworkers' Company were "Sable, a chevron ermine between two habricks, in chief argent, and a thistle in base, or ; crest, a ram passant, or ; supporters, two griffins, or ; pellette". These arms appeared, together with the arms of the City and of other Companies, on the barge of the first pageant. Now Taylor selects one of the most picturesque details of the arms to play a major part in his second pageant. In this he was following a common custom. Exotic animals are always a success in popular pageantry, and the mayoral poets supplied them in considerable numbers. At the same time they often contrived to compliment ¹ the Lord Mayor or the Company from which he was drawn by using animals which were part of relevant heraldic devices. In this way lynxes, leopards, camels, unicorns and many other animals found their way into the Shows.²

The conception of Time in this pageant is somewhat perfunctory. Of all his possible properties, the only one with which he is credited in the descriptive pamphlet is his scythe. Even the reduced Old Father Time still known is more elaborate than this. Taylor's interest in Time, indeed, is mainly verbal : he shows considerable dexterity in dealing with the implications of the phrase "to use one's time". Appropriately in a City Show, the affairs with whose successful carrying through Time is concerned are commercial ventures. There is, for the Puritan City, the somewhat sober note at the end,

And *Time* will bring you to Eternity.

¹ E.g. G. Peele, *Device of the Pageant* (1585), sig. A2 ; A Munday, *Metropolis Coronata* (1614), sig. B2^v ; T. Middleton, *Loue and Antiquity* (1619), sig. C4 ; J. Webster, *Honor* (1624), sig. B4.

² E.g. G. Peele *Device*, sig. A2 ; J. Webster, *Honor*, sig. B4 ; I. B. Londons *Triumph* (1656), p. 12 ; E. Settle, *Triumphs of London* (1692), p. 3.

The figure of Truth does not appear in the pageant as described ; yet several lines of the speech are devoted to her. The disparity here is perhaps a result of the exclusion of the poet from the invention of the device. Truth, as she appears in the speech, is as inferior to the traditional Truth as Taylor's Time is to the traditional Time. Time and Truth were favourite figures of Renaissance allegory. Truth brought to light by Time represented variously, all over Europe and also in England, Protestantism victorious, Catholicism victorious, and personal triumph.¹ The most celebrated appearance of the pair in pageantry was in a tableau of Queen Elizabeth's coronation procession in 1558.² Time and Truth as they are in *FAME and HONOUR* stem from this Renaissance tradition, but in a vastly weakened form. The two basic ideas of the allegory had been that Truth was brought to light by Time and that her emergence was a hard and costly business. There is no trace of either idea in this Show. It merely happens to be the case that Time is the father of Truth. He does not show this by acting as the strong and powerful father painfully assisting his daughter to return into the light of day. What he has done and what he will do relate only to the Lord Mayor. In the pageant Truth does not appear ; but in the speech she is the strong partner : it is she who has raised Sir Robert Parkhurst to the mayoralty. Yet Taylor was aware of the more effective tradition. In his explanation of the

meaning of the second Pageant being Time and Mercury

he says that

Truth is the daughter of *Time*, who though falshood may obscure her, yet *Time* will bring her forth at last, where her bright vertue shall outshine the Sun.

Why, then, did Taylor not use this more meaningful conception? Queen Elizabeth, when she saw the pageant of Time and Truth during her coronation entry, made a remarkable response :

¹ For a full discussion of this question, see F. Saxl, " Veritas Filia Temporis ", in *Philosophy and History*, ed. R. Klibansky, and H. J. Paton (1936).

² Anon., *The Royall Passage of her Majesty from the Tower of London, to her Palace of Whitehall, with all the Speeches and Devices, both of the Pageants and otherwise* (1588) (B.M. C. 33.e.7 (11) ; cf. C. 33.e. 7. (15)).

Time, quoth she? and Time hath brought me hither.¹

Thus she identified herself with Truth. If Taylor were to have used the ideas implicit in the Time-Truth relationship in the Lord Mayor's Show, he might have been forced into too close a connection between Truth and the Lord Mayor. This would in the first place have been ridiculously pretentious, and would moreover have sounded blasphemous to Puritan ears. Behind Queen Elizabeth's reaction were no doubt memories of the great ideological as well as personal struggles of the previous years. The 1634 Lord Mayor had no such epic excuse for identifying himself with Truth, and Taylor was well advised to avoid such an interpretation of the tradition. Heywood, in *Londons Ius Honorarium*, 1631, followed Elizabeth's pageant closely and deliberately; but he made the part of Truth as small as possible.

Taylor does not seem to have been influenced by Heywood's use of the same figures, but there is possibly a connection between Middleton's *Triumphs of Truth* and both the second and third pageants of *FAME and HONOUR*. Middleton's Show is concerned with the struggle between Time and Truth, and Error. Its basic conceptions are in some ways very like those of *FAME and HONOUR*. In particular Time has declined into a rather laughable powerless old man, while Truth has the strength to banish her enemies and to raise the Lord Mayor to his present eminence. Take away Truth's enemies, as Taylor does, and only a rather meaningless association of Time and Truth remains. And that is indeed the situation in Taylor's pamphlet.

The function ascribed to Mercury is interesting since it shows one of the humblest of the pageant-poets regarding his work as art. From the point of view of the Companies the purpose of the Show was the honour of the Citie & worshipp of this company.²

The pageant-poets, with their dedications to Lord Mayors and Companies, with their lavish praise and flattery, were certainly conscious of this civic aspect of their contract. The demands and customs of the Show—praise and flattery in tone, and the

¹ Anon., *The Royall Passage of her Majesty from the Tower of London, to her Palace of Whitehall, with all the Speeches and Devices, both of the Pageants and otherwise* (1588) (B.M. C. 33.e.7 (11); cf. C. 33.e. 7. (15)), sig. B4.

² Haberdashers' Hall MS. *Minutes of the Court of Assistants* (1582-1652). 30 September 1586, fol. 27.

use of Company arms, Company history, and Company processes in content—were not very conducive to artistic creation. Ben Jonson¹ and Chapman² both referred unfavourably to the pageants. But Ben Jonson himself devised a mayoral pageant. It is a pity his descriptive pamphlet³ has not survived, so that we could have seen what a major poet, fresh from considering, in connection with King James's royal entry, the theory of such public entertainments, would have made of the occasion. Many of the best Shows, from the artistic point of view, were devised by poets who, like Jonson or Taylor, were preparing their first mayoral pageant. Dekker's *Troia-Noua Triumphans*, 1612, Middleton's *Triumphs of Truth*, 1613, and Webster's *Monuments of Honor*, 1624, all seem the work of men trying to use well the form inherited by them. Among Webster's devices is one in honour of learning. It shows Sir Thomas White dreaming that he must found an Oxford College where two oak trees grew out of one root; the as yet non-existent College appears in miniature. Another device honours literature by including major English poets: Chaucer, Gower, Lydgate. Taylor lacked Webster's talent, but he brought to the Show a similar interest in its artistic possibilities and, as we shall see, its literary affiliations. Mercury, or Hermes, was the patron of a number of widely different activities and qualities, any of which Taylor might have chosen. In particular, he might very appropriately have invoked Mercury as the god of commerce. But instead Taylor prefers to see him as the patron of art. He is invoked for the poet as god of eloquence, and for the "artificer" as god of invention.

The third pageant⁴ is a model of a city representing London, with walls, Battlements, Gates, Churches, Towers, Steeples and lofty Buildings, and some Antique shapes here and there on the tops of the highest Edifices: Also with shops and men at worke upon cloth, as Cloth-workers, fullers, shermen, and others, the walls of the Citie being adorned round, with Armes and es-cutcheons of the Cittie and company.

¹ B. Jonson, *His Case is Altered* (1609), sig. A2^v.

² G. Chapman, "Dedication prefaced to *The Odyssey*", *Works of Homer* (1616), sig. A4.

³ The pamphlet was certainly printed, since Haberdashers' Hall MS. *The Yeomanry Account* (1604) includes an item: "paid for printing the bookes of the device 001. 10. 0."

⁴ *Fame*, sig. A7-A8.

This model is ornamented with various figures : Antiquity, Record, Memory, Wisdom, and others. The speaker,

an ancient Matron in a civill grave robe with her haire long hanging downe in trammels dishevelled behind her backe, sitting in one of the Gates of the Citie,

represents London. In her speech she gives thanks to God

That I doe see this day, and now am seene
The Queene of Cities, Empresse of content,
And Princesse of unmatched government.

She contrasts herself with the great cities of the past—Thebes, Carthage, Jerusalem, Babylon—and of the present :

Constantinople doth in sorrow lye,
And groane beneath the Turkish tyranny :
Rome, and all Cities that hold Rome supreme,
Their glorie's are eclips'd or but a dreame ;
Whilst fire and sword doth Germany molest,
London's secure, with peace and plenty blest,
Turke, Pope, and war, beare here no rule or sway,
For I one God, one King, one Law obey ;
Ther's my security, and my state doth stand
Supported by the unsupported hand.

Humanly speaking, the greatest virtue is industry, and industry brings success :

An Idle Citizen is like a Moth,
One spoyles b'example t'o [t] her spoyles the Cloth,
True Citizens are the true Cities sonnes,
The others are but bastards, mad that runnes,
Like Runnagates, or cursed Imps of *Caine*,
And never shall to Honours seat Attaine :
Worke on my Lads, and you in time may be,
Good members of this Honour'd Company.

In this water pageant of Thetis and Thamesis Taylor expressed praise of London in three aspects : the City, the Companies, and the Lord Mayor. His pageant of Time and Truth was addressed principally to the Lord Mayor, but the presence of the griffins, supporters of the Clothworkers' arms, alluded to the Company. This third device is in honour of the Clothworkers' Company and of the City.

The imagery of the pageant is pleasant but not unusual. It may derive, as the figures of Time and Truth may derive, from

Middleton's *The Triumphs of Truth*. In that Show¹ London was

a Graue Foeminine Shape . . . attired like a reuerend Mother, a long white haire naturally flowing on either side of her : on her head a modell of Steeples and Turrets. . . .

Middleton's London herself was not an original invention. Many of her properties appeared in comparable personifications of place in Ripa's *Iconologia*, first accessible in 1611 and at once a collection of Renaissance allegory and a source-book for it. But it was Middleton who combined the characteristics and called the resulting figure London. The re-appearance, therefore, of a figure called London very similar to Middleton's figure of that name, and of a similar conception of Time and Truth, suggests that Taylor was borrowing from Middleton.

The cloth-working scene shows the men of the Clothworkers' Company split into their groups. In the Middle Ages there had been a Company of Fullers, or men who cleansed and thickened the cloth, and a Company of Shermen, or cloth-shearers, who turned the cloth and left the nap. But Henry VII, in 1528, had united the Fullers and Shermen to form the Clothworkers, the twelfth and last of the major Livery Companies of London.² The form of the pageant is a reminder that in the seventeenth century one could still see, if one looked into the shops as one passed, people inside plying their trade of making or finishing their goods.

Since the basis of the Lord Mayor's Show was commercial, one might have expected a pageant of London to present her as the pre-eminent trading city, compared and contrasted perhaps with Antwerp and Venice. Webster, in *Monuments of Honor*, had devised just such a tableau. But Taylor's frame of reference is exclusively religious and politico-religious. By placing London with Babylon, Jerusalem and other such cities Taylor challenges comparison with the most famous cities of antiquity. By his comments on the cities of the present Taylor claims London's superiority. The heart of Eastern Christianity, Constantinople, is Turkish ; the best days of Rome are past ;

¹ T. Middleton, *Truth*, sig. A4.

² W. Perburt, *History of the Twelve Great Livery Companies of London*, 2 vols. (1836), ii, 644-5.

and Germany, divided in religion, is torn by civil war. This is a statement of point of view rather than of detailed historical reference. Constantinople had been Turkish since 1453, and while the notion of threatening Islam was still a powerful stimulant, yet the danger had in fact been receding since the defeat of the Turks at the gates of Vienna in 1529 and at Lepanto in 1571. Seventeenth century Turkish leaders were on the whole less energetically aggressive. Conversely, the threat of Rome was increasing with the success of the Counter-Reformation; and the near-success, on several occasions, of the Roman Catholic parties in the Thirty Years' War showed Rome once more on the offensive in the very area where the Reformation had started. Taylor, however, takes a very long backward view: Constantinople, Rome, and Germany were less powerful or happy than they once had been, whereas more than ever before

London's secure, with peace and plenty blest.

Her peace and prosperity are caused by her virtue in religion, and as a corollary, disaster elsewhere is associated with false religion. Thus we have the familiar correlation between true religion and success.

In fact, England also was splitting up into mutually hostile camps and exploded into war seven years after this Show was presented. Of course, ordinary men at the time did not foresee such an unlikely event, and it is only to the wisdom of after-knowledge that Taylor's proud words take on a somewhat pathetic irony. A sadder, less arrogant treatment of the theme of England's peace appeared in Heywood's *Londini Status Pacatus*,¹ 1639, the last of the mayoral pageants to be presented before the troubles of the Civil War put an end to them for several years:

*WAr, to the unexperienc'd, pleasant shoves,
But they who in the Progresse and the Close
Shall trace it, know it horrid; 'Tis a time
Destin'd, to the revenge, and scourge of Crime:
. . . And such a Time is War, and such the throwes
Our neighbour Nations travell now in; woes
Quite desperate of delivery: whilst calme Peace,
Prosperity, and Plenty, with increase
Of all concatinated Blessings smile
With cheerefull face on this sole-happy Isle.*

¹ T. Heywood, *Londini Status Pacatus* (1639), sigs. C2^v-C3^v.

Just as the religious opinions expressed by Taylor have a decided Protestant tone suited to the City of London, so the social opinions have a note of sobriety and determination suited to the same body. Lazy people are not real citizens ; there is room only for the industrious. But to the industrious, however lowly, no door is closed. The final couplet must have been shouted to the crowd of spectators normally beyond earshot :

Worke on my Lads, and you in time may be,
Good members of this Honour'd Company.

This pageant is the last to be " explained " at the end of the pamphlet. As before, Taylor's remarks give the reader historical and geographical background information rather than an interpretation of the device. Carthage, for example,

was a goodly Citie in *Affrica*, it was 40 English miles in circuit, it was held against the Romans 44 yeares when *Rome* was in her greatest greatnesse, it brought forth the valiant Captaine *Haniball*, and was at last destroy'd by *Scipio Affricanus* 144 yeares before Christs birth ; the place and country where it stood is now called *Tunis*, which is a harbour or Receptacle for Pirats, sea-Rovers and mis-beleeving *Turkes*.

The fourth pageant ¹ of *FAME and HONOVVR* is a round tower on a quadrangular base. At the top of the tower sits a royal figure, with ball and sceptre. Below him are four pairs of figures : a Lord Mayor and Honour ; a Bishop and Piety ; a Judge and Power ; and a General and Victory. Below these again are four more pairs : an Apprentice and Obedience ; a Scholar and Patience ; a Clerk and Diligence ; and a Common Soldier and Virtue. On the corners of the quadrangle are the Four Cardinal Virtues. Taylor's account does not show how the abstractions were to be identified. The usual way was by properties and dress. The emblem of the mayoralty, Honour, is the speaker. He begins by showing how

Low steps begin to mount the highest hills,
Great Rivers have their heads from little Rills.

The tableau illustrates this theme. As the clerk, soldier, and scholar rise by the exercise of their typical virtue so

from th' apprentice seven yeares servitude
Proceeds the grave gowne, and the Livery-Hood,
Till (in the end) by merit, paines and care,
They win the Grace to sit in Honours chaire.

¹ T. Heywood, *Londini Status Pacatus* (1639), sig. A8-B^v.

Once a man has gained power, his quality is shown by the way in which he employs it. The Lord Mayor is to remember that

Authoritie's the touch-stone of the minde,
And shewes which way the bearer is inclin'd :
For having power joyned to his will,
It makes him much more good, or much more ill :
That Justice without Mercie's cruelty :
That Mercy without Justice is much worse,
Breeds scorne, contempt, makes power to leese her force.

But honour has entire confidence that the Lord Mayor will rule well :

Tis treble Joy that you doe wisely know
To mix those vertues well, and to bestow
Them justly, as occasion shall incite :
To gard the good, and make wrong render right.

This pageant is structurally the most complex in the Show. Its central ideas are unusual. Superficially, the tableau seems an expression of the medieval conception of the organic state, adapted to suit a commercial economy. The king is supreme ; below him are the representatives of the parts of the State ; below them again are their assistants. But on closer inspection the device turns out to be an ingenious expression of the view that the individual can and should try to rise in the world by the exercise of the virtue most suited to his calling. This theory of a characteristic virtue recalls the drama of humours, the dominant idea being now applied again to real life.

The Lord Mayor's place in this tableaux is no more prominent than that of the general or the judge or the bishop. But the fact that the speech is delivered by Honour, and the contents of the speech, make the pageant peculiarly the Lord Mayor's. It was customary in public pageantry to deliver some observations on good government and to exhort the person in authority to rule well. Some pageant-poets carried out this rather exacting task without being either critical or sycophantic. Middleton, for example, devised a tableau¹ in which Reward and Justice kept an empty seat between them. On the Lord Mayor's approach Reward wanted to invite him to take the seat, but was restrained by Justice since

Great works of Grace must be requird and done,
Before the honor of this Seate be won.

But Taylor claims such faith in the Lord Mayor's abilities and intentions that Honour's remarks are mere flattery.

The fifth pageant ¹ is Endimion riding on a ram's back before an "ancient monument of fame", ornamented with the Armes, Escucheons, Hatchments and Impresses of divers Lord Mayors that have bin of the worshipfull company of the Cloth-workers.

Endimion speaks first of himself and his fellow shepherds :

I am *Endimion*, that of yore did keepe
Upon th' Arcadian hills my harmeles sheepe :
Whereas by study, and by observations
I found the Moones change and her variations,
And for my sake the Swaines doe still prefer
The booke ycleap'd the shepherds Kallender.
Apollo kept *Admetus* sheepe (tis said)
And *Tamberlaine* (whom Mighty Kings obey'd)
Was once a shepherd, and the *Time* was when
That shepherds were the noblest, ablest men.

He relates the ram on which he rides to the sign of the Zodiac, which the sun enters in March and turns to gold. Thus Taylor arrives at the progression of

Wooll turn'd to Cloth ; and Cloth by transformation,
. . . turn'd to gold, that you may say with joy,
That *Iasons* fleece (to yours) was but a toy.

Many Companies owed their existence to the sheep kept by shepherds, for

By picking wooll, thousands releife doe gaine,
As many carding, spinning doth maintaine :
Wooll-men, a great and wealthy trade doe drive,
Weavers, in great abundance worke and live,
The Clothiers, Fullers, Tuckers, Shermen, Dyers,
From the sheepes fleece have feeding and attires.

But the Clothworkers' is a key Company on which the prosperity of many others depends. For

all these Trades, which I doe here infer,
Have all relation to the Cloth-worker,
For were it not for him the rest were nothing,
He onely makes it Cloth, and fit for Clothing.
Without the Cloth-worker, the Drapers Trade
And Merchants Traffick would decay and fade,
These from the fleece get Clothes and nutriment,
For (under heaven) the Ram's the Instrument.

¹ *Fame*, sig. B^v-B2^v.

This pageant is followed by

A dance of shepherds with drinking in leather bottles to the monument.

This device is specially in honour of the Clothworkers' Company. Once more a part of the Clothworkers' arms, the ram, their crest, appears ; and the City successes of the Company are celebrated by the insignia of the Clothworker Lord Mayors displayed on the "ancient monument of fame". Company devices were common in mayoral pageantry. The personages were usually relevant to the Company trade : Indians and planters, for example, might appear in Grocers' Shows,¹ and Vulcan or Mulciber in Ironmongers' Shows.² Shepherds were appropriate not only to the Clothworkers, but also to the Drapers and were frequently employed in the pageants of that Company.³ They probably owe their popularity to the continued success of the pastoral. Taylor's reference to

The booke ycleap'd the shepherds Kallender

points this literary ancestry and Taylor's awareness of it. Pastoral conventions, however, would normally exclude the violent, disturbing figure of Tamburlaine. His inclusion is an example of the pageant-poets' disregard for the decorous keeping apart of materials usually considered incongruous. Thanks to Marlowe's play, everyone knew that Tamburlaine had started life as a humble shepherd and had risen to the dizzy heights of empire. Hence he was considered suitable to mayoral pageantry.

In 1634 Taylor wrote *Taylor's Pastorall*, a poem whose substance was partly repeated in *FAME and HONOUR*. The poem was dedicated to Apollo :

APollo (father of the Sisters nine,
I craue thy aide t' inspire this Muse of mine,
Thou that thy golden Glory didst lay by
(As *Ouid* doth relate most wittily)
And in a Shepheards shape, didst deigne to keepe
Thy Loues beloued Sire, *Admetus* sheepe.⁴

¹ E.g. T. Middleton, *Honor and Vertue*, sig. B^v ; T. Jordan, *London Triumphant* (1672), pp. 3-5 ; T. Jordan, *Triumphs of London* (1678), pp. 8-10.

² E.g. A. Munday, *Sidero-Thriambos* (1618), sig. B-B2^v.

³ A. Munday, *Himatia-Poleos* (1614), sig. B3^v-B4^v ; T. Heywood, *Porta Pietatis* (1638), sig. B^v-B2^v ; T. Jordan, *Triumphs of London* (1675), pp. 15-20 ; T. Jordan, *London in Luster* (1679), pp. 9-13.

⁴ J. Taylor, *Taylor's Pastorall* (1624), sig. B.

Tamburlaine appears also in this poem :

a *Shepherd* was,
The *Terrour* of the world, that famous man
Who conquer'd Kings, and kingdomes over-ran
His stile was, (as some stories do repeate)
The *Scythian Shepherd*, *Tamberlaine* the great.¹

In an appendage Taylor discusses the history of the Clothworkers.

The dance of the shepherds recalls the dance of the sailors and watermen. It is another device to add life and movement to the Show.

It was the custom in mayoral Shows to give inflated importance to the organizing Company. In this case, the Clothworkers are held to have the key to prosperity for a whole group of Companies, major and minor. In fact, since all are equally necessary, they are no more the key than any of the others, though perhaps such inflation was particularly necessary to the pride of the Clothworkers, since they were the last of the twelve "great" Companies, and were long rivalled by the Dyers, who were the first of the minor Companies.²

This pageant, which was exhibited at the corner of St. Lawrence Lane and Cheapside, where the procession turned North to enter the Guildhall for the Banquet, was the last of the Show proper. The final device³ was presented outside the Lord Mayor's house at night. It was more complex than such final devices usually were, but consisted mainly of elements from previous tableaux. The purpose of the tableau was the interpretation of "the ancient monument of fame", which had appeared but played little part in the fifth device. Fame, a new figure, stood in front blowing her trumpet to encourage Sir Robert Parkhurst to follow in the glorious steps of past Clothworker Lord Mayors. Time, the speaker, a figure from the second pageant, listed former Lord Mayors and showed the meaning of this monument.

Then know, this ruind peice doth shew that stones
And tombes consume, as doe their owners bones,
For *Time* is circular in his affects,
Builds and throwes downe, and ruins and erects :
But fortune, death or fame, or *Time* cannot
Make vertuous men, or vertue be forgot.

¹ J. Taylor, *Taylor's Pastorall* (1624), sig. B3.

² W. Herbert, *Twelve Great Livery Companies*, ii. 646.

³ *Fame*, sig. B2^v-B4.

This, as it applies now to past Clothworker Lord Mayors, will one day apply to Sir Robert Parkhurst :

you, with *Time* shall be together blest,
And *Time* shall bring you to *Eternall Rest*.

THE TRIVMPHS OF FAME and *HONOVVR* is a fairly typical seventeenth-century Lord Mayor's Show. It is not intrinsically of any great literary or artistic interest, though it indicates some of the ways in which more impressive literary forms and achievements filtered down into these popular entertainments. It also shows how traditional methods of allegory and Renaissance aristocratic conceptions were put to the service of a developing middle class society, which was becoming actively hostile to traditional authority, which was interested in commercial success, and whose own artistic culture, when it developed in the characteristic form of the novel, was to be predominantly concerned with contemporary real life. In the Lord Mayors' Shows, therefore, were realistic scenes devoted to the trading on which London depended. The allegorical scenes themselves were somewhat simpler than those of the aristocratic entertainments, since both the intended audience and the devisers were less skilled in allegory and the classics. Most of this applies particularly, perhaps, to John Taylor, who was himself uneducated in the academic sense and a prominent member of the Watermen's Company.¹ His particular interests as a waterman are reflected occasionally in his Show.

In certain ways the Shows are of historical interest. Taylor's illusion to the silting up and clearing of the Thames, for example, refers to a tiny point of detail ; but it is a point vital to the prosperity of a country increasingly depending on foreign trade. But one can rarely use the Shows as source books for matters of fact. They do, however, express bourgeois attitudes very clearly. Private enterprise is both possible and desirable. London's successful commercial development is directly related to her religious correctness ; and the misfortunes of other nations to infidelity or heresy in religion. War, including civil war, is regarded as a disaster.

¹ M. Rushforth, *John Taylor the Water Poet* (M.A. thesis, London, 1924), pp. 16-21, shows that Taylor was a Royal Waterman and a sometime Ruler of the Watermen's Company.

This Lord Mayor's Show was not Taylor's only incursion into public festivities. In 1613 Princess Elizabeth, the daughter of James I, married Frederick, Elector Palatine. This marriage was taken as consolidating the Protestant position in Europe and caused great popular rejoicing. It was celebrated with fireworks and bonfires and spectacles on the Thames. The title-page of the pamphlet describing these celebrations read :

Heauens Blessing, / And / Earths Ioy. / OR / A true relation, of the / supposed Sea-fights & Fire-workes, as were accomplished, before the Royall Celebrations, of the al-beloved Mariage, / Of the two peerlesse Paragons of Chri- / stendome, FREDERICK & / ELIZABETH. / With / Triumphall Encomiasticke Verses, consecrated to the Immortal memory of those happy and blessed Nuptials / By *John Taylor*, / [Line] / [Woodcut of ship] / Imorinted at London for *Ioseph Hunt*, and are to be solde / [Bottom of page cropped].

This pamphlet, despite Taylor's name on the title-page, is a composite work. It consists of a sixteen-line poem to Sir James Murray, signed by Taylor ; a description of a spectacle in the form of a sea-fight, unsigned ; and five descriptions of firework displays ascribed in sub-headings to various persons and signed by them. Certainly if any person named had a hand in devising the sea-fight, it would be Taylor. It was very unusual to employ one person to devise spectacles and another to describe them. But this device required no literary hand. It was a mock fight between the Turks and the Christians. There were sixteen Christian ships, including a Venetian argosy, and sixteen Turkish galleys. The whole device sounds noisy, and naturally there were no verses attached to it. This pamphlet is accompanied under the same press mark in the British Museum Library by another :

Epithaleames. / OR / ENCOMIASTICK / TRIVMPHALL VER- / ses, consecrated to the immortal me- / mory of the royall Nuptials, of the two Princes and Paragons of Christendome, / *Frederick* and *Elizabeth* / . . . / By *Iohn Taylor*. / [Ornament] / Printed for *Henry Gosson*, and are to be sold at his / shop on London Bridge. 1613.

This pamphlet consists of a set of fairly complicated verses in honour of the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth. Hence Taylor's part in the public nuptial celebrations was an account of the device and verses in honour of the marriage. Probably neither he nor any other poet devised the spectacle.

In 1623 England rejoiced again, this time because a royal marriage did not take place. London celebrated Prince Charles's return from Spain with bell-ringing, bonfires, and feasting, and John Taylor wrote the pamphlet, *PRINCE CHARLES HIS WELCOME FROM SPAINE*. The celebrations included no pageantry.

When Charles I returned from Scotland in 1641 Lord Mayor Gurney arranged a welcome for him. Taylor's pamphlet, *Englands Comfort, and Londons Joy*, described the procession and gave some verses which were recited and

presented to the Kings own Hand by *Iohn Taylor*.¹

There may have been some attempt at pageantry, devised by Taylor, and related to his occupation as a waterman, for he observes that

*I have transform'd a Boat from off the Thames,
Into a Horse, to come to welcome thee.*¹

Nevertheless *THE TRIVMPHS OF FAME* and *HONOVVR* is Taylor's principal contribution to seventeenth-century pageantry.

¹ J. Taylor, *Englands Comfort and Londons Joy* (1641), [p. 8].

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
ABERDEEN